LEONID LIVAK

IN SEARCH OF **RUSSIAN MODERNISM**

VISIT…

In Search of Russian Modernism

Hopkins Studies in Modernism
Douglas Mao, Series Editor

In Search of Russian Modernism

Leonid Livak

Johns Hopkins University Press
Baltimore

© 2018 Johns Hopkins University Press
All rights reserved. Published 2018
Printed in the United States of America on acid-free paper
9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1

Johns Hopkins University Press
2715 North Charles Street
Baltimore, Maryland 21218-4363
www.press.jhu.edu

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Livak, Leonid, author.
Title: In search of Russian modernism / Leonid Livak.
Description: Baltimore : Johns Hopkins University Press, 2018. | Series: Hopkins studies in modernism | Includes bibliographical references and index.
Identifiers: LCCN 2018000281 | ISBN 9781421426419 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 9781421426426 (electronic) | ISBN 1421426412 (hardcover : alk. paper) | ISBN 1421426420 (electronic)
Subjects: LCSH: Modernism (Aesthetics)—Russia. | Modernism (Aesthetics)—Soviet Union. | Modernism (Literature)—Russia. | Modernism (Literature)—Soviet Union.
Classification: LCC BH301.M54 L58 2018 | DDC 891.709/004—dc23
LC record available at https://lccn.loc.gov/2018000281

A catalog record for this book is available from the British Library.

Special discounts are available for bulk purchases of this book. For more information, please contact Special Sales at 410-516-6936 or specialsales@press.jhu.edu.

Johns Hopkins University Press uses environmentally friendly book materials, including recycled text paper that is composed of at least 30 percent post-consumer waste, whenever possible.

Contents

Acknowledgments vii
Note on Translation and Transliteration ix

Introduction. Modernism as a Culture 1

1 The Toponymical Labyrinth of Russian Modernist Culture 38

2 The Errant Compass Rose of Russian Modernist Studies 78

3 Russian Modernism in Time and Space 113

4 Navigating Russia's Cultures of Modernity 152

5 Russian Modernism in the Cultural Market 183

Conclusion 228

Notes 233
Bibliography 313
Index 365

This page intentionally left blank

Acknowledgments

It is difficult properly to acknowledge the many conversations and productive disagreements that have shaped this book. My greatest intellectual debt, as usual, goes to my teachers, Omry Ronen (1937–2012) and Alexander Dolinin, from whom I have learned the art and value of doubt. My work on this project has benefited tremendously from intellectual exchanges with colleagues in North America and Europe, whose readiness to hear me out, even if ending in vigorous objections, stimulated my reflection on the subject of Russian modernism. They are David Bethea, Gregory Castle, Catherine Depretto, Lazar Fleishman, Stefano Garzonio, Jean-Philippe Jaccard, Luba Jurgenson, Hélène Menegaldo, Claudia Pieralli, Roman Timenchik, Irina Shevelenko, Gennadii Obatnin, Andrei Ustinov, Eduard Waysband, and Lukasz Wodzynski. I owe a special debt to Douglas Mao, editor of the Studies in Modernism series at Johns Hopkins University Press, for his enthusiastic and unwavering support of this project. Stephen Dodson and Carrie Watterson helped me copyedit the manuscript.

My work on this project has been partly funded by a Standard Research Grant from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada. I have also benefited from a residential fellowship at the Institut d'études avancées de Paris (Agence nationale de la recherche, programme "Investissements d'avenir," ANR-11-LABX-0027-01 Labex RFIEA+), whose director, Gretty Mirdal, and staff—Marie-Thérèse Cerf, Geneviève Marmin, Simon Luck—went out of their way to facilitate my research and writing.

As always, Ann, Josephine, and Isabelle do much to remind me what really matters, and for that I am ever grateful.

This page intentionally left blank

Note on Translation and Transliteration

This book consistently follows the Library of Congress transliteration system for words originally written in Cyrillic characters. Proper names with commonly accepted English spelling (e.g., Dostoevsky, Babel, Gorky, Tolstoy) are written as such in the main body of the text and are transliterated according to the Library of Congress system in the notes and bibliography.

All translations from foreign languages into English are my own unless otherwise specified.

This page intentionally left blank

In Search of Russian Modernism

This page intentionally left blank

Introduction

Modernism as a Culture

This book is driven by the self-interest of a teaching professor whose job it is to pluck authors and texts from the teeming mess of the literary process and arrange them in a coherent narrative—call it "literary history"—suitable for administering to students in judicious doses, as measured by semesters and assigned readings. This cut-and-paste exercise is problematic at the best of times, when one can at least find consolation in the multiplicity of available methods of selection, triage, combination, and dosage that, for all their reductiveness, add diversity to the inherent bias of literary history. But such consolation grows small indeed when a paradigm shift in an academic field invalidates its conceptual framework and methodological assumptions. This happened when the disintegration of the Soviet empire brought about the implosion of the established vision of twentieth-century Russian cultural history.

Modernist studies were among the main academic beneficiaries of the USSR's demise. In the Soviet critical discourse, modernism had been an abusive catchall concept serving as a foil to officially approved art and thought.[1] Western scholarship, meanwhile, lacked knowledge about Russian modernism. In part, this was because the topic's taboo status in the Soviet Union placed many documentary sources out of reach. It was also because Russian studies in the West did not initially escape Cold War logic: some academics, appalled by the Communist project, shunned modernist art and sensibility because of their intertwined aesthetic and political extremes, while others willy-nilly embraced the Marxist vision of modernism as a rictus of the dying "bourgeoisie."[2] Consequently, systematic inquiry into Russian modernism, as distinct from the study of its individual representatives or practices, emerged in the West only in the 1970s, defying Soviet ideological opprobrium; made its way into the USSR in the late 1980s; and finally flourished in the 1990s.[3]

The post-Soviet documentary deluge and the collapse of the ideological coordinates hitherto guiding the writing of cultural history unleashed a Copernican revolution in the study of Russian modernism. That revolution is not over, but its translation into new literary-historical narratives, and thence into university curricula, has already proven problematic.

Having spent a quarter century interrogating various facets of modernist art and thought, I am now confident only in the inadequacy of my understanding of Russian modernist experience. Nor do I see a remedy for this epistemological doubt in the writings of my colleagues. Since the 1990s, students of Russian modernism have thrived on the rediscovery of authors and artifacts, and on the interpretive rereading of an ever-expanding textual corpus. This empirical focus—archival, textological, biographic, hermeneutic—has dominated Russian modernist studies at the expense of theoretical reflection that could open new vistas in our understanding of the object of research.[4] We have failed thus far to translate the quantity of newly available and carefully analyzed material into the conceptual quality of our academic field, leaving the writing and teaching of Russian cultural history fundamentally unchanged. And this is where a teaching professor's self-interest meets a researcher's curiosity. I am dissatisfied not only with the conceptual framework shaping the study of Russian modernism but also with its presentation in the classroom.

Although this book had been long in the making, the impetus for writing came as I answered a student's query about my reasons for excluding Leonid Andreev from a course on fin-de-siècle Russian literature. I reflexively justified the omission by the need to prioritize authors chosen for a semester-long sprint according to their aesthetic, historical, and typological importance. On second thought, that explanation sounded hollow with respect to Andreev. I had to admit, above all to myself, that my choices had been dictated by the biases I had absorbed, in part, from the partisan canon codified by Russian modernists and later espoused by my own teachers as a counterweight to the official Soviet literary canon, and, partly, from that very Soviet canon whose aversion to the modernist sensibility of Andreev's mature work had relegated him to the literary-historical periphery. A contemporary survey of the Russian literary curriculum at North American universities confirmed that I was not alone in my pedagogical travails. It showed that, despite the collapse of the ideological grid predicated on Soviet experience, the writing and teaching of Russian literary and cultural history had not qualitatively changed since the 1980s, with some relatively minor adjustments.[5]

I think the current state of Russian modernist studies testifies as much to the role of intellectual inertia in academic life as to methodological barriers hindering the revision of outdated literary-historical narratives. These narratives are informed by the contrastive "pre-Soviet/Soviet/anti-Soviet" paradigm that, for many decades, has shaped the study of Russian cultural life, expediently subsuming in political problematics thorny issues of typology, terminology, classification, chronology, periodization, and so forth. For example, even as we struggle to articulate in nonideological (read, post-Soviet) terms the distinction between the writers conventionally considered "modernists" and those dubbed "realists," we rarely question the actual validity of such a contrast or the soundness of the underlying taxonomical criteria, taking for granted many assumptions that were hotly contested by the very authors we so classify.[6] To take another example, we are equally hard pressed to explain why some "modernists" should be considered "avant-gardists" in contrast to others. Nor do we really know where to seek common denominators better suited for conceptualizing Russian modernist practices in the 1920s–30s than such (geo-)political and aesthetically moot categories as "fellow traveler," "Soviet," and "émigré."[7] And the list of problems goes on and on.

One way to deal with the issues inherent in the historical description of the literary process is to dismiss them as artificial. For Perry Anderson, modernism is "the emptiest of all cultural categories," because it "lacks in positive content" as an anachronistic portmanteau concept whose referents are too diverse to fit under one "ism," upsetting the monological harmony of the critic's Marxist outlook.[8] But Anderson's political nemesis, Vladimir Nabokov, also treats the tools of literary history with ironic detachment. Granted the luxury of teaching literature as a series of great books, among which he stakes a place for his own novels, Professor Nabokov ridicules the scholastic "fascination of categories" and proclivity for "the vague terms 'classicism,' 'sentimentalism,' 'romanticism,' 'realism,' and the like," as so many ways to condone the "incomprehension of true genius." But, a few sentences later, Nabokov the Pushkin scholar admits to the necessity of the same critical tools he abhors as an artist, that is, as their potential target.[9]

Having paid ample dues, like most students of Russian modernism, to the empirical focus on the specific and the particular—new archival sources and bibliographic data, close readings and extensive textual analysis—at the expense of theoretical conceptualization, which is inevitably sweeping and anachronistic in its generalizing ethos, I submit that a methodological revi-

sion is high on our field's agenda. Like Gabriel Josipovici, I readily concede that "there is no physical entity called 'modernism'"; but I also share his belief that "something did happen to art [. . .] around the turn of the century," and that "Proust, Joyce, Picasso, Klee, Schoenberg, and Stravinsky, for all their manifest individuality, do have something in common."[10] In the Russian field of cultural production, to use Pierre Bourdieu's pragmatic terminology, that something lasted until the fall of Paris, in 1940; and it has been inadequately described because of the political vicissitudes of twentieth-century Russia.[11]

Modernism, then, is a useful generic abstraction, an analytical tool unlocking interpretive possibilities, even if its signified never existed in a pure empirical form any more than the referents of other abstractions—liberalism, fascism, democracy, capitalism, totalitarianism—whose instrumental role in scholarship is, likewise, a necessary evil for students of cultural history.[12] The analytical productivity and explanatory value of such critical tools as "baroque" or "romanticism," which Brian McHale dubs "discursive artifacts," outweigh Anderson's and Nabokov's objections, provided we resort to these tools with Northrop Frye's warning in mind that "any such conception [. . .] is at one or more removes from actual literary experience."[13]

I have found validation for my epistemological doubt in the "new modernist studies" that emerged in Anglo-American literary scholarship in the 1990s, even as Russian cultural historians were breaking free from the ideological dynamic of the Soviet era, largely oblivious of contemporary developments in this cognate field. The new modernist studies challenged the basic methodological assumptions codified by the New Criticism and the Marxist tradition running from Georg Lukács and the Frankfurt school to Fredric Jameson. Although limited to Anglo-American material, this revisionist project, embodied in the journal *Modernism/Modernity*, is driven by the same frustration with the established canon, chronology, geography, taxonomy, and sociology of modernism that informs my inquiry.[14] In this study, I repeatedly resort to the analytical tools developed and tested by the new modernist studies.

To be sure, my book will not propose a coherent revisionist picture of Russian modernist experience, since no overarching historical narrative is possible or indeed desirable, given the state of Russian modernist studies. Instead, I will interrogate the field's methodological assumptions, removing the aura of certainty surrounding the analytical tools at our disposal and

suggesting alternatives to the conventional ways of thinking Russian modernism. Nor do I intend to refute extant interpretations of modernist experience, for I am more interested in exposing their limitations. I will advocate for many "partial truths," as Virgil Nemoianu puts it with reference to romantic studies, when he proposes "a framework inside which the truths of other scholars could coexist," provided one does not treat "romanticism" as "a fixed quantity [but rather] as a cultural process."[15]

Applying these premises to modernist studies, I believe that our unrelenting effort to define modernism has been futile and counterproductive. First of all, because such "will to definition" misses the nature of our object of research as a mercurial and multifaceted *cultural process* that can only be described at various stages of its evolution rather than pinned down in a single definition. And, second, because definitions, by their very nature, tend to generate reductive canons that hinder our research object's description and conceptualization as a fluid and contradictory historical phenomenon.[16] Back in 1922, Boris Tomashevskii insisted that literary scholarship should approach its subject matter with no "a priori definitions of essence," just as "one could study electricity without knowing what it was."[17] Similarly, in this book, I will advocate for a methodological shift in focus—from the vexed effort to *define* modernism to the inquiry into modernism's *uses* as an abstract analytical concept that facilitates the study of cultural processes and their participants. I will downplay the importance of the question, "What is modernism?" by replacing it with other questions: "What is modernism for?" and "How can we speak about modernism?"

The main issue with the critical "will to definition," which is yet another expression of the empirical bias reigning in Russian modernist studies, is the resultant catalogue vision of our object of inquiry. This vision is plagued by the flaws inherent in any attempt to define modern cultural phenomena that, from romanticism onward, have been complex hybrids comprising aesthetics, philosophy, lifestyle, and metaphysics.[18] While the criteria chosen for any given definition are supposed to contrast modernism to other "isms," the resultant catalogues lack inner cohesion, because little effort goes into clarifying the interrelations of their constitutive elements. Consequently, all such definition criteria, predicated as they are on the logic of opposition between literary-historical "isms," are rigidly static because they ignore the evolution and diversity present in any cultural system. Finally, in their striving for exhaustiveness, extant definitions of modernism generate criteria that

are supposedly specific to a given historical moment but ultimately prove vague enough to be applicable to European cultural expression from the Renaissance on.

A typical example of this catalogue fallacy is Norman Cantor's model of modernism as a culture of anti-Victorianism—an Anglocentric assumption limiting from the outset the model's utility. Cantor lists fourteen aesthetic and philosophical peculiarities of modernism. All of them, however, are germane to several epochs in European cultural history; are unequally applicable to or absent from different national modernist traditions, which exhibit more inner diversity than Cantor allows; and are limited to discrete periods within the larger time span of various national modernisms.[19] A more recent definition, this time by Russianists, reduces the catalogue to seven criteria, equally vulnerable to criticism.[20] Ironically, such essentializing definitions achieve the opposite of their intended goal, eroding modernism's historical distinctiveness and thereby impeding the identification and analysis of modernist artifacts.[21] In chapter 2, I address this methodological issue by examining several definition criteria that have become paradigmatic in the codification of modernism and actually obfuscate it as our object of research.

Instead of attempting yet another definition of modernism, I would like to focus on a more productive way of thinking about this generic abstraction, namely, the idea of modernism as a culture, suggested but unexplored in Cantor's model. This conceptual approach, constituting a minor methodological trend in modernist studies, was pioneered by Irving Howe, who spoke about "the culture of modernism" sporting distinct ethics, values, outlook, and sensibility, and by Peter Gay, who strove to "enlarge the territory of modernism" beyond aesthetics and into intellectual history. The approach then received a sociological dimension in Robert Wohl's treatment of modernism as a "counterculture" whose emergence and continuity were predicated on the rise of several consecutive generations of European artists and intellectuals shaped by special historical circumstances.[22]

My vision of modernism differs from that in *The Cambridge Companion to Modernist Culture* (ed. Celia Marshik, 2015), where the titular category functions as a comprehensive period term referring to all artistic, intellectual, social, economic, and technological practices at a chronologically defined moment in Western history. I find this approach too undifferentiated to be of heuristic use. As I argue below, my idea of modernism is that of a minority culture and an interpretive community that coexists with other cultural formations and cannot define a historical period because of its limited public

impact. However, contrary to Raymond Williams's narrow notion of "cultural formations," which the critic deployed with reference to modernist artistic factions, I do not reduce modernism to cultural producers only, because their public must be included in the notion of modernist culture as well.[23]

The conceptualization of modernism as a culture or, even more specifically, a cultural community, holds significant heuristic and interpretive potential. This much is clear from the concept's recurrent invocation by those students of modernism who do not wish to limit their purview to aesthetic conventions. Instead, they imagine modernism as "a shared mentality [that] holds together the mosaic of names, factions and ideas" (B. Gasparov) or, capitalizing on Wohl's approach, "locate modernism in the context of the material and socioeconomic history" (Cooper).[24] But the main methodological advantage of treating the object of modernist studies as a culture resides in the diversity of analytical perspectives afforded by the concept of culture itself. What follows, then, is a brief overview of the analytical potential inherent in the approach to modernism as a cultural community, which I advocate throughout this book.

Culture and Cognition

Following Clifford Geertz's understanding of culture as a mechanism for organizing information, modernism can be described as an evolving system of values, ideas, practices, and conventions—ethical, social, mythological, philosophical, aesthetic—suffusing human experience with meaning.[25] Such framing opens modernism to integrative and interdisciplinary analysis, including the necessary extension of scholarly inquiry beyond traditional artistic media in order to account for modernist culture's socioeconomic and institutional history and for its treatment of everyday life as a medium for creative expression through aesthetically meaningful behavior. The latter practice, common in Russian modernism, pursued the same ultimate goal as other types of modernist creativity—the transformation of the human condition, which, as their end goal, continuously informed the self-stylization of Russian modernists as "much more than an artistic movement."[26]

Early observers among the positivist intelligentsia, dominant in the Russian field of cultural production until the 1900s, read modernist ideas, values, and practices as a "form of cognition applicable to all aspects of human experience."[27] Accordingly, they saw modernist ontology and epistemology as a rival "way of relating to the world" that amounted to "a different type of culture," inimical to "all those who cherished the culture [of the intelligent-

sia] grounded in reason."[28] For all its polemical intent, this early conceptualization of Russian modernism is more comprehensive than its latter-day understanding as a worldview or a mentality.[29] Treating modernism as a fixed set of ideas about the world or as a collective mental structure, rather than an evolving cognitive system that makes sense of life, we risk leaving out modernism's nonintellectual, intuitive aspect—a sensibility that binds together an otherwise fractious milieu. Russian modernism accommodated a number of competing worldviews and mentalities linked by a "way of relating to the world" that ensured the culture's continuity, keenly felt by its participants, from Petersburg and Moscow in the 1890s to Paris in the 1930s.

In 1914, Semën Vengerov brought "the patchwork of literary trends" multiplying in Russia since the 1890s to the common denominator of "psychological leavening" (*psikhologicheskaia zakvaska*) that had at its core "the consciousness of living in extraordinary times."[30] A decade later, tacitly drawing on Karl Mannheim's generational theory, Victor Zhirmunskii spoke of the modernist sensibility as an "entelechy [that] teleologically connected" art and ideas to "some fundamental 'feeling of life,' some peculiar 'intuition of existence' revealed to a poet or to an entire age."[31] Writing in the 1930s, Fëdor Stepun mused about the "consciousness" of Russian modernism as a marker of an epoch, implicitly drawing on the self-description of early modernists as carriers of "the new consciousness" (*novoe soznanie*).[32] These accounts by an outsider to modernism (Vengerov) and by its partisan actors suggest the existence of some shared *sensibility* behind the variegated values, ideas, practices, and conventions of this cultural formation. As Vladislav Khodasevich self-referentially put it, using the term Symbolism as a synonym of "modernism":

> Symbolism had a *genius loci* whose spirit spread far. Those who have breathed its air are forever marked by something, some special traits [. . .] The "people of Symbolism" and of its environs have ways of recognizing each other. They have something in common not only in their writings but in their very personalities. They may hate each other, feud, nurture mutual disdain, yet [. . .] they are kith and kin, in contrast to the contemporaries whom they experience as strangers [. . .] with whom they easily strike tactical alliances, because all "strangers" are alike. The people of Symbolism "do not cross-breed." Such are the law and the biology of culture.[33]

Those partaking in Russian modernist culture, then, had at their disposal a cognitive system that gave meaning to events in artistic, social, and private

life. Or, as another veteran modernist, Ivanov-Razumnik, put it, "To have the right to [be associated with] Symbolism, one had to understand it not only as a literary current, not even as a psychological category, but as a cognitive category [*kategoriia poznavatel'naia*]; in other words, not only as a world-view but also as a form of experiencing the world [*ne tol'ko mirovozzrenie, no i mirovospriiatie*]."[34]

The phenomenon of the *Russian modernist sensibility* was obvious to the culture's "insiders" and "strangers" alike. Take the exiled critic and scholar Al'fred Bëm, a "stranger" to modernism and Khodasevich's tactical ally in émigré literary feuds. Fresh from reading the volume of the Soviet academic series *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* devoted to early modernism (1937), Bëm recalled Khodasevich's verdict about the "people of Symbolism" and aired his "amazement at the extent to which literature had been for them a question of life [. . .] As if their entire life had been invented, composed, synced with poetry."[35] Incidentally, this was precisely the quality Bëm and Khodasevich denounced (the first sincerely, the second for reasons of literary politics) in the contemporary theory and practice of the *Chisla* circle in Paris—the epicenter of late Russian modernism in the 1930s.

What Vengerov described as the "psychological leavening," Zhirmunskii as the "entelechy," and Khodasevich as the "genius loci" of modernism—and what I call *the modernist sensibility*—was the sense of staring into a spiritual, cultural, and social chasm between past and present, a sense informing all of Russian modernism's historical stages. Such eschatological intuition of an ending and the concomitant longing for a clean slate united the disparate and feuding actors of Russian modernist culture, making it part and parcel of the transnational modernist field. True, the borders of the perceived chasm between past and present regularly shifted to accommodate fresh modernist cohorts. Each up-and-coming generation proposed more reasons for the uniqueness of its own historical time. The pioneers of Russian "new art" traced their sense of crisis to the nebula of social and cultural shifts begotten by the political and economic development of late imperial Russia, labeling their epoch *sovremennost'* (modernity). Their successors justified the same urgent sense of crisis differently, filling the notion of modernity with more content. Some cited wars and revolutions; others aired disenchantment with capitalism and liberal democracy; yet others traced the modernist sensibility to the recession of religious belief as the traditional core of individual identity. Finally, all actors in Russian modernist culture vacillated between the vocal denunciation and tactical courtship of the consumerist mass culture.

Yet, designating modernity as the source of their shared identity, Russian modernists recognized the historical unoriginality of their crisis sensibility. The periodic recurrence of this sensibility linked them, in an oxymoronic *tradition of rupture*, to the "moderns" of early Christianity, who had launched the term *modernus* to denote their break with the pagan past, and thence to the self-designated "moderns" of the Renaissance, the Reformation, the French Revolution, and so forth.[36] This tension between claims to historical uniqueness and the awareness of the cyclical return of the crisis sensibility was acute in Russian modernism, whose self-consciousness drew on a long comparative view of European cultural history as a means of overcoming the perennial Russian complex of belatedness.[37] Consequently, Russian modernists showed considerable independence from the tropes of their own identity rhetoric, occasionally calling *modernity/sovremennost´* "a perfectly fictional construct" (Bachinskii) and the resultant crisis sensibility "a sham" (Z. Gippius).[38]

Such critical detachment of the objects of modernist studies from the terms of their own self-description reminds us not to take these terms at face value. For example, those who polemicize with *modernism* as an analytical tool of literary and cultural history often target the concept of *modernity* as a myth that aids in "the -isming of a period," as Frank Kermode put it, adding that "we now identify that period as Modern (later, Modern*ist*) which of course all periods once were." Pushing this logic further, Bruno Latour questions the existence of a causal link between modernity and cultural expression ("No one has ever been modern. Modernity has never begun").[39] A more moderate critique accepts the thesis of causality with the caveat that "the modernist artist may have exaggerated the uniqueness of his historical situation."[40] Missing from this welcome circumspection is the acknowledgement that the modernist artist was, more often than not, aware of the hyperbole and abstraction inherent in her concept of modernity. Such self-consciousness is manifest in the modernist culture of Russia, whose belated and partial socioeconomic modernity was always more of an aspiration, and an apprehension, than a fact of life.

It seems more productive to focus our inquiry on the varied uses, rather than the empirical veracity, of claims to the uniqueness of the historical circumstances informing the sensibility of a modernist cultural community, in Russia or elsewhere. Such a pragmatic approach to modernist self-modeling is justified by the fact that we are dealing here with symbolic behavior—"an intervention in the field of the politics of time"—as Peter Osborne calls

modernist self-stylization, which he treats as a distinct "culture of time" that mediates the identities of several cohorts of artists and intellectuals born between the mid-1860s and early 1900s.[41] Debunking the rhetoric and tropes of modernist identity—be it disruption, impermanence, chaos, degeneration, or eschatological anxiety—as mythical, because unoriginal from a *longue durée* historical perspective, is a tautological exercise. Such critical deflation has been performed repeatedly by our own modernist research objects, who, nonetheless, imbibed the "hypertrophied historicism" of their culture as a mode of cognition.[42] In contrast, exploring the uses and evolution of the imaginative language informing modernist self-fashioning, one ultimately arrives at a pragmatically *functional* methodology that offers a *descriptive* alternative to the *definition-centered* approach dominant in Russian modernist studies and grounded in the literal reading of self-legitimating practices among the carriers of the modernist sensibility.

Culture, Mythology, Politics

This brings us to another methodological advantage of treating modernism as a culture. In its quality of a cognitive mechanism, culture is a system of myths. The main function of myth is to relate a "story of the beginning" that furnishes a model for meaningful activities and supports the translation of human experience into cultural texts. The centrality of myth to human imagination, as a way of ordering information and coping with existential dilemmas and anxieties, does not diminish with the secularization of society.[43] Modernism developed its own mythology. The modernist culture of time, obsessed with the past in its problematic relation to the present and its rejuvenating potential for the future, found expression in the unrelenting imaginative search for the true and pure beginnings in matters spiritual, aesthetic, racial, psychological, linguistic, and national. Lost in the bustle of modernity, these genuine beginnings had to be recovered, because, as many modernists believed, they could revitalize and revolutionize the human condition. Today, we can instrumentalize the constitutive tropes of this mythology as taxonomical props for identifying the evolving positions of authors and texts vis-à-vis a national modernist culture by virtue of their engagement with that culture's myths. A fuller picture of Russian modernist mythology requires a sustained, collective scholarly effort. I will only tentatively outline here the heuristic potential of such a description on the examples of a few stock mythologemes—"the bourgeois," "degeneration," and "chaos."

Cultural historians single out anti-bourgeois rhetoric as a unifying feature

for otherwise disparate modernist authors and feuding factions. But the fluid and polysemous concept of "the bourgeois" has always sported a broad semantic and axiological range. In Russia, where the bourgeoisie, in its European economic sense of the urban middle class, was virtually absent until the twentieth century, the concept's closest equivalent, *meshchanstvo*, had neutral connotations as the official designator of an urban social estate. In contrast, in the culture of the Russian intelligentsia, which seldom identified with the European-style urban middle class and predominantly espoused the ideology of agrarian Populism, the term and concept of *meshchanstvo* carried an ethical stigma. It opposed the intelligentsia's idealized vision of the peasantry (*narod*), cast as the nation's spiritually pure body, to the corruption inherent in tsarist autocracy and in Western capitalist modernity.[44] In the culture of Russian Marxism—the intelligentsia's fin-de-siècle offshoot that replaced the fetish of *narod* with the equally mythical figure of "the proletariat"—the notion of "the bourgeois" (*burzhuaziia*) was primarily a negative economic marker. However, in the usage of Russian Marxists, the trope's connotations increasingly overlapped with those of *meshchanstvo* the further one moved along socialism's ideological spectrum. Thus, in the Bolshevik imagination, like in that of its Fascist and Nazi counterparts, "the bourgeois" functioned as a generic sign of spiritual, intellectual, cultural, and socioeconomic adversity.

Russian modernist culture, in turn, sported its own notion of the bourgeois, articulated with reference to the term's other contemporary meanings.[45] Like their Western peers, Russian modernists deployed the mythologeme as a form of negative aesthetic and philosophical judgment—a practice hearkening back to the romantics who had used "the bourgeois" as a marker of cultural philistinism.[46] "Romanticism needed philistinism [*filisterstvo*]," wrote Boris Pasternak, "for without the bourgeois [*meshchanstvo*] it lost half of its meaning."[47] And so did Russian modernism, whose exponents called "bourgeois" any artistic or intellectual practice they rejected, both within and outside their culture.[48] Another important semantic function of the bourgeois in Russian modernist rhetoric consisted in expressing a transcendentalist critique of modernity as the source of life's mundane materiality.[49] The daily grind, or *byt*, was the ultimate bugaboo of the Russian modernist sensibility, whose carriers located the institutional epitome of *byt* in the traditional family with its bourgeois ideals of stability, domesticity, and reproduction—the opposite of the modernist thirst for the sacred and the heroic.[50]

Such confluence of anti-traditionalism and anti-materialism distinguished the Russian modernist uses of "the bourgeois" from the mythologeme's function in the discourses of the intelligentsia and of Russian Marxists, indicating the fault lines between modernism and its rivals in what Nicholas Daly calls "a broader culture of modernity."[51] Modernists placed the peasants and the proletariat under the rubric of spiritual *meshchanstvo*, seeing in the fetishization of these groups by the Populist intelligentsia and Marxists, respectively, an expression of their competitors' crass materialism. As a result, Russian modernist polemicists often cast the intelligentsia and Marxists as homologous manifestations of a Janus-faced "bourgeois" modernity, despite the generalized aversion among Russia's educated elites to the free-market economy and political liberalism, which modernist culture fully shared with its rivals.[52]

Given the polysemy of the bourgeois trope, it is hardly surprising that polemical exchanges between the intelligentsia, as the most authoritative of Russia's elite cultures before 1905, and its fin-de-siècle offshoots and challengers—Marxist and modernist—revolved around the mutual accusation of *meshchanstvo/burzhuaznost'* (bourgeois essence).[53] And, like the notion of modernity, that of the bourgeois was often dismissed by its own users as fictional.[54] Yet, such were the mythologeme's imaginative appeal and rhetorical expediency that it never lost its discursive prominence. After Lenin's coup, the insult only gained in gravity and ambiguity. As a Soviet political trope, it denoted the Marxist state's enemy, albeit vaguely, since the label's applications had little economic logic. The Bolsheviks codified as bourgeois all political, economic, intellectual, and artistic events inimical to the interests of their regime, all the more so because they were at a loss to find the proletariat in Russia's largely agrarian society.[55] Concurrently, Soviet Marxists stood accused of bourgeois transgressions by their intelligentsia and modernist critics.[56]

The mythologeme of the bourgeois helps us map an individual's evolving position vis-à-vis modernist culture and its contemporary alternatives. The trope's varied uses could overlap, effecting a rapprochement among cultural rivals.[57] Such contiguity in mythology allowed a number of littérateurs to shuttle between antagonistic milieus. For instance, torn between modernism and Marxism at different stages of their careers, self-avowed Bolsheviks Aleksandr Bogdanov, Anatolii Lunacharskii, and Maxim Gorky did not readily fit within a single culture of the educated elites; nor did R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik and other artists and intellectuals who married old-style intelli-

gentsia Populism to the modernist sensibility.[58] The liminality of such authors in the Russian field of cultural production transpires in their efforts to reconcile the conflicting meanings of *meshchanstvo* (or *burzhuaznost'*) in Marxist, modernist, and intelligentsia cultures. Incidentally, these efforts generated much anxiety in each rival culture, whose self-styled guardians of partisan purity endeavored to codify the proper meaning of the bourgeois trope, as if its misinterpretation threatened their particular culture's ethos and integrity.[59]

Other modernist mythologemes have similar heuristic potential. Degeneration is a case in point. A commonplace of European cultural mythology from the late nineteenth century to the Second World War, the specter of degeneration haunted scientists, medical professionals, politicians, artists, and journalists. Like the bourgeois, the polysemous trope of degeneration mediated the interpretation of life in an age of profound socioeconomic and cultural shifts. It facilitated the organization of knowledge into a narrative countering the Enlightenment myth of progress with deep apprehension about modernity's effects on the individual and society.[60] The degeneration mythologeme furnished a common discursive strategy for conceptualizing modernity, providing a space where the rival cultures of the educated elites overlapped.[61]

In this shared mythical space, Max Nordau's anti-modernist vitriol in *Degeneration* (1892), lent itself to contradictory rhetorical purposes. The Russian intelligentsia establishment, like its positivist counterparts in the West, saw in Nordau a "degenerate" demagogue, yet they appropriated his vision of modernism as a form of mental and physical decline.[62] And so did Russian Marxists, who prefigured German Nazis and Italian Fascists in the practice of contrasting the "health" of their own culture to the "degeneration" of their foes.[63] Modernists, too, mocked Nordau. For them, he was a cultural philistine whose rhetoric they nonetheless appropriated to various ends. At times, Russian modernists proudly wore "degeneration" (*upadok*, *vyrozhdenie*) on their sleeves as an eschatological sign of the world's imminent end and humanity's subsequent rebirth: the more advanced the decline, the closer the apocalyptic renewal. But the trope of degeneration had other uses as well. It functioned as a frequent insult in intra-modernist feuds, as well as a Nietzschean rebuke to the culture of positivism, stigmatizing the intelligentsia and other believers in the Enlightenment myths of progress and scientific reason.[64]

In the mythical space shared by the rival cultures of the educated elites

that arose across Europe as a result of and in reaction to modernity's social and cultural processes, modernist aspirations to the tabula rasa renewal of the human condition met the equally utopian Marxist, Fascist, and Nazi revivalism targeting the perceived flaws of the historical moment.[65] Semantic variations in the rhetorical deployment of the degeneration mythologeme have, therefore, considerable heuristic value. On the one hand, heeding the different implications of the degeneration trope in the pronouncements of individual authors, we can trace their evolving positions vis-à-vis various cultures of modernity that often overlap in the Nietzschean critique of the world and the human condition.[66] Bertold Brecht's, Georg Lukács's, Dmitrii Mirskii's, and Vladimir Maiakovskii's trajectories from modernist to Marxist cultures are cases in point, as are Wyndham Lewis's and L.-F. Céline's rapprochement with Nazism, or F. T. Marinetti's, Ezra Pound's, and Le Corbusier's embrace of Fascism. On the other hand, differing interpretations of the degeneration myth allow us to distinguish competing cultures. Witness the clashing readings of Oswald Spengler's *Decline of the West* (1918–22) by Russian Marxists and modernists.

Bolsheviks, whose investment in the myth of progress and the attendant exaltation of social and technological modernization were haunted by the fear of modernity's degenerative potential, interpreted Spengler's musings about culture's replacement with mechanistic civilization as yet another portent of the decline of the bourgeoisie. In this reading, Spengler's "bourgeois" litany merited attention only insofar as it boded well for the Communist project of regeneration, wherein "the USSR was a shield of the future on the chest of dying Europe."[67] In contrast, Russian modernists, at home and in exile, treated Spengler's book as an intellectual milestone. Some saw in it a positive sign of the postapocalyptic (because postwar/revolution) spiritual shift in Europe, which, unlike Soviet Russia, resisted the materialist pressure of modernity for the sake of that genuine spiritual regeneration anticipated by the modernist sensibility of crisis. Other modernist commentators found in Spengler's prophecies a proof that recent apocalyptic catastrophes had failed to bring about the desired "revolution of the spirit." Hence their conclusion that artists and intellectuals must stoically partake in Europe's spiritual malaise by going into "cultural catacombs" and sheltering "the last values" from the onslaught of materialistic (bourgeois) modernity in all its liberal-capitalist and totalitarian varieties.[68]

Differentiation between modernism and its rivals by means of mythological analysis acquires additional importance in light of the recent scholarly

tendency to (con)fuse the anti-liberal cultures of modernity thanks to their discursive affinities. But such rhetorical overlaps hardly make Marxism any more homologous to modernism than their overlaps in space and time—as when the Bolsheviks turned the art nouveau mansion of the Petrograd ballerina Matylda Krzesinska into their headquarters, which became, in April 1917, Lenin's public tribune after his return from Zurich, where he had resided a few doors down from the Dadaist Cabaret Voltaire. There exists, no doubt, an intellectual interface among modernism, Marxism, Fascism, and Nazism predicated on their common mythopoeic search for true beginnings and alternative modernities.[69] Yet their amalgamation as "modes of modernism" (Roberts) is counterproductive, even if we distinguish "cultural modernism" from "political modernism" (Griffin) or draw a line between "modernism in aesthetics and modernism in social theory" (Crook) to explain the anti-modernist aesthetic germane to totalitarian movements whose focus on technological modernization and social engineering some scholars see as "modernist responses."[70] By this logic, the *Communist Manifesto* (1848) becomes "the first modernist manifesto" and Karl Marx "a modernist radical."[71] Whereas Lenin's coup is read "not just as an attempted Marxist transformation of an absolutist system into a socialist regime, but also as a modernist experiment in designing and building a new society."[72]

The laudable rationale of such studies is undeniable. They argue for a fuller understanding of modernism by taking inquiry beyond artistic expression. But their conflation of different, even clashing, visions of alternative modernity does a disservice to modernist culture. As I argue in the fourth and fifth chapters of this book, Russian modernists often styled themselves as rivals to political movements rather than passive fellow travelers. The latter notion, institutionalized as early as 1919 in Carl Schmitt's theory of "political romanticism," condescendingly strips modernists of independent agency, despite the fact that they claimed authority in extra-artistic matters, professing the spiritual and intellectual superiority of cultural producers over political activists thanks to the modernist belief in the supreme transformational power of creative activity.[73] Furthermore, this reductive vision oversimplifies national modernist cultures: it obscures their historical record of accommodating a range of worldviews far from limited to totalitarian ideologies.[74] Such lack of differentiation transforms modernist studies into an exercise in ethical value judgment. Rather than focus on a given modernist culture for its own sake, scholars explore its status as a spiritual and intellectual source of Hitler's, Stalin's, or Mussolini's policies.[75] But this

amalgamation grows tenuous indeed when we compare the diverse meanings that the same mythologemes carry in modernism and in its rival cultural formations.

Take, for example, Zygmunt Bauman's just observation that the perception of modernity as illegibly chaotic, and the resultant "task of order," are paramount to most worldviews emerging between the turn of the century and the Second World War.[76] Citing discursive affinities among Europe's cultures of modernity, rooted in shared mythology, some scholars equate modernism's transcendental striving beyond the "chaos" of mundane existence to concurrent projects for reordering or making sense of the individual and society—from Keynesian economics and Freudian psychoanalysis to Soviet and Nazi social and biological engineering.[77] But this equivalence is tenuous. While political and eugenic schemes drew legitimacy from the scientific ethos of positivism, modernism disqualified rational cognition as a tool for explicating the world and the human being.

Russian modernist culture conceptualized the human condition and the universe primarily in aesthetic terms—beauty versus ugliness; cosmos/order/harmony versus chaos/disorder/disharmony; art/dream versus the mundane/the bourgeois—and viewed artistic creativity as the main instrument for learning about and transforming the world.[78] Within this *pan-aesthetic* mind-set, the mythologeme of chaos denoted an existential state whose transcendence was the horizon of the ideal. No modernist intellectual trend or artistic faction had a plan for realizing this ideal, beyond the eschatological mishmash of anarchic and anti-capitalist aspirations, dubbed "the revolution of the spirit" (*revoliutsiia dukha*) and imagined as an outcome of life's transformation through art after the demise of the old world in sociopolitical cataclysms (a prospect that grew ever dimmer in the interwar period).[79] Such combination of grandiloquence with the absence of a coherent and practical program—the "political romanticism" that, according to Carl Schmitt, transnational modernism had inherited from its romantic antecedent—struck the critics of Russian modernism as its Achilles' heel and deplorable "spiritual maximalism."[80] In contrast, Keynes and Freud, eugenicists and racial scientists, Lenin and Mussolini, Stalin and Hitler read life as chaotic inasmuch as it did not conform to their fixed grids of interpretation and action, which all of them understood as based on the latest scientific insights and technological achievements, no matter how irrational or utopian their agendas may strike us today.

The casting of modernity as the force of alienation and fragmentation

was a discursive commonplace in the cultures of Europe's educated elites. Another such mythological commonplace was the notion of order as the holistic and organic state to which humanity must be restored. The phobia of disorder was common in equal measure to the self-declared positivist Nordau as to his modernist whipping boys. In Russia, where the liberal ideals of free-market economy and cultural democratization remained on the margins of public discourse, anxiety about modernity's social fluidity and cultural pluralism dogged the traditional intelligentsia as much as it haunted the intelligentsia's Marxist and modernist challengers.[81] There was no lack of theoretical and artistic statements about the "chaos" of modernity in every Russian modernist cohort.[82] Most such statements appealed to Charles Baudelaire's idea of art as a tool for transcending the "transient, fleeting, and contingent" nature of "modern life" into "the eternal and the immutable"—an intellectual tradition that intensified between the world wars, when Ortega y Gasset mused, much to the liking of Russian émigré modernists, about art's status as the sole "social agent" capable of bestowing order on the "chaotic, shapeless, and undifferentiated" world.[83]

Overlaps among the rival cultures of modernity were inevitable, since they drew from the same pool of ideas, myths, and phobias. Ezra Pound, for example, adamantly denied his own anti-Semitism, while cheering for the Nazis by virtue of sharing their conception of Jews as agents of modern "chaos"—a stock trope of European cultural mythology informing both Pound's rhetoric and that of Nazi theorists.[84] Yet most modernist attempts to cross into rival cultures were too opportunistic or idiosyncratic to bear fruit. Not accidentally, Soviet Marxists dismissed those modernist coteries (Cubo-Futurists, the LEF, Constructivists, etc.) which tried to pass for artistic expressions of Bolshevism.

Equating modernism to Marxism, Nazism, or Fascism, we treat these cultures out of context. For instance, reducing Russian Formalists and Bolsheviks to the common denominator of "semiotic totalitarianism" (Morson), thanks to their shared striving to make legible the chaos of modernity, we ignore the philosophical incompatibility of modernism and Marxism, which can be gauged by comparative mythological analysis.[85] In the early 1920s, when public debate was still possible in Russia, the Formalist firebrand Shklovskii faulted Bolsheviks for their "inability to grasp the anarchic and irrational nature of life," which made a mockery of Marxist theory and found better explanations, according to Shklovskii's modernist peers, in Henri Berg-

son's and Albert Einstein's thought.[86] Similarly, Ivanov-Razumnik mocked as plagiarism those elements of modernist mythology (e.g., the demiurgic reordering of the world) that popped up in the writings of Soviet ideologues: Marxism, from a modernist's viewpoint, was too materialist to heed the true goal of socioeconomic change—"the revolution of the spirit."[87] Soviet Marxists, in turn, oversaw the suppression of the rival cultures of modernity as part of the "return to order."[88] Characteristically, exiled Russian modernists used the mythologeme of chaos to demarcate themselves from Marxist culture back home. Postulating the impossibility of a clear vision of the world and the human being, they interpreted the Stalinist call to order as but another manifestation of the chaos of modernity. "Our revulsion for Marxism is, above all, revulsion for blindness," wrote Georgii Adamovich about the Soviet striving to "impose order upon real life." For the modernist littérateur, ideological schemas simply could not tame elemental chaos.[89]

This book reconfigures our understanding of politics in modernist experience by treating politics as a process of interrelations among cultural formations. Discarding the tired narrative about modernists as fellow-traveling "revolutionary romantics," I view them as autonomous actors in pursuit of their own socioeconomic agendas. Chapter 4 examines modernism's rapports with Russia's other cultures of modernity—the intelligentsia, Marxist, and mass culture. Chapter 5 explores, among other things, the political economy of modernism in the Soviet and émigré subsystems of the Russian field of cultural production. Both chapters show that the minority cultures of the Russian intelligentsia, modernism, and Marxism were locked in a mutually defining relationship and that, despite their many antagonisms, there existed much porousness and overlap among these rival cultural communities of the educated elites.

Without denying the importance of politics in modernist experience, I aim to depoliticize its study. For most of the past century, Russian modernism functioned as an ideological lightning rod thanks to its status as the bugaboo of Soviet cultural watchdogs. In many ways, this situation persists today, making any effort to implement a new conceptual framework in Russian modernist studies contingent on the revision of the field's entrenched political biases. This revision begins with scholarly terminology, which, as I show in chapter 1, often takes on a life of its own, directing research instead of facilitating it. The subsequent two chapters examine the mythologemes that arose in the course of Marxist culture's relations with its modernist

rival. Here I show that by taking Soviet and anti-Soviet myths at face value, we perpetuate an entire series of methodological assumptions contributing to the present status quo in Russian modernist studies.

Since the conceptual approach to modernism as a culture requires its study in relation to other cultures of modernity, such an investigation is necessarily country specific, shedding light on variations in national modernist experiences that are shaped by different historical circumstances. For instance, the phenomenon of the intelligentsia is peculiarly Russian and is unknown in other European countries with notable modernist cultures, whether Austria, France, Germany, Italy, or Great Britain. Likewise, while owing an intellectual debt to Russian émigrés, National Socialism became a culture, as Johann Chapoutot shows, mostly in German-speaking lands, whereas the quasi-official attempts to create its precedent, the Black Hundreds, in tsarist Russia bore little fruit.[90] Russia, in contrast, developed its own Marxist culture reliant on a distinct system of ethical, philosophical, mythological, and aesthetic values and practices. In chapter 4, I trace the historical dynamic among the intelligentsia culture and its Marxist and modernist offshoots, all of them vying for the status of Russia's intellectual and moral avant-garde.

Several related issues are left out of this book for reasons of spatial economy. I will not address, in detail, interaction among national modernist cultures in and outside the areas under Russian political dominance—that continuous circulation of people, texts, styles, and ideas allowing us to conceive of *transnational modernist culture*. Here I borrow from Andreas Huyssen's distinction between the terms "international," "referring to the relations between states or cultures," and "transnational," which "points to the dynamic processes of cultural mingling and migration."[91] Nor will I broach in depth the problems inherent in the transplantation of a national modernist culture, as distinct from the geographic mobility of its individual actors, into a foreign field of cultural production—a salient feature of Russian modernist experience, whose story is also that of a long-term expatriation. This book argues for the investigation of modernism as an atlas-like series of maps, with each map changing our vision of the same cultural space, depending on the thematic filter applied. Other scholars may want to examine Russian modernism in its transnational context, knocking down disciplinary boundaries. I do not do so because the specific interests guiding my thematic choices delimit what can be done in a single monograph. I continuously account for Russian modernist experience within its transnational context, but such a vast topic cannot be adequately treated here. My hope is that the method-

ological debate this book stirs will result in renewed scholarly attention to historical rapports between Russian and other national modernist cultures.

Finally, in demographic terms, this book will deal with minority cultures developed by Russia's educated elites at a time when spreading literacy and mass media made cultural democratization a fact of daily life. The intelligentsia, modernism, and Marxism were not the only minority formations of the educated elites in the Russian field of cultural production. Suffice it to recall the concurrent existence, in Russia's predominantly agrarian society, of the premodern cultures of the aristocracy, the clergy, and the merchantry (the latter, by its values and intellectual horizons, was the closest to the demographically dominant peasantry). All of them supplied fresh recruits to the intelligentsia and to its modernist and Marxist rivals, while movement in the opposite direction—such as Sergei Bulgakov's trajectory from Marxism and modernism to clerical culture, or modernist poets' migration to the clergy (Sergei Solov'ev) and to the peasantry (Aleksandr Dobroliubov)—was rare.

Given Russia's demographic makeup, interaction between the minority cultures of the educated rested on their mutual recognition as islands in the sea of mass culture, which eventually engulfed them all. In the West, the ultimate triumph of mass culture followed the logic of the free-market economy. In the USSR, the same outcome was accelerated through the suppression of the cultures of the educated elites, premodern and modern, by their victorious Marxist rival. Ironically, Marxism's attempt to refashion Russia in its own ideological image proved self-destructive. The traditional elitism of Russian Marxism mutated, for pragmatic reasons of statecraft, into Stalinism's embrace of mass culture. As I argue in chapters 3 and 4, this development contributed to the philosophical and aesthetic evolution of late Russian modernism, sheltered by exile from its Marxist competitor.

Culture, Community, Cartography

The existence of a culture is contingent on the presence of a group that is sustained by a communal ethos with roots in a shared cognitive system, sensibility, and mythology. In the case of modernism, this community includes cultural producers (writers, painters, philosophers, etc.), mediators (critics, editors, publishers, translators, patrons, impresarios), and consumers (readers, listeners, viewers)—roles that can also be variously combined in one individual. Spread out geographically and temporally, this community owes its sense of cohesion and historical continuity to print media. It is, then, *imagined* by its members, since the formation of modern cultural con-

sciousness is akin to the processes Benedict Anderson outlined in his archeology of national identity formation.[92]

Modernist culture's distinctiveness is predicated on its function as an "interpretive community" (Fish), or a "semiotic community" (Fokkema), that bestows a range of meanings on human experience.[93] Within this interpretive community, tropes drawn from the common pool of contemporary European mythology—like the mythologemes of the bourgeois, degeneration, and chaos—have specific implications setting modernism apart from other cultures of the educated elites. This community, whose aesthetic and intellectual "horizon of expectations" (Jauss) evolves in response to social, political, and economic circumstances, and to rival interpretive communities, codifies ideas and practices as alien or belonging to its cultural sphere.[94] So much so that two contemporary authors—say, Oscar Wilde and Rudyard Kipling—can end up in different interpretive communities within one national field of cultural production, despite their shared mythological, intellectual, and aesthetic baggage.[95]

Thinking modernism as a culture, we can write its history not as a canon-setting narrative about a chronological succession of significant artistic and philosophical works and their creators, but as a story of a self-identified and self-conscious community. In other words, we can locate each national modernist culture in its specific and evolving historical context—artistic, social, economic, intellectual, political—which shapes the creation and reception of values and artifacts, and accounts for the variety of modernist experiences in different countries.[96] Among the benefits of such reframing are the alternative ways of envisaging the stubborn issues of modernist taxonomy, geography, and chronology.

On the one hand, given the present methodological impasse of the definition-centered approach to modernism, there is much heuristic value in examining the reasons and motivations behind the fluctuating and contradictory reception of authors and texts in national modernist cultures. In chapter 2, I interrogate the stock classification tools of modernist studies, which selectively and anachronistically elevate discrete artistic practices to the status of universal taxonomical criteria. I contend that these tools are historically unsound, because, as an interpretive community, Russian modernism knew periods when new ways of reading poetry trumped experimental prosody, whereas aesthetically traditional prose narratives were received more favorably than iconoclastic ones.

On the other hand, as I argue in chapter 3, the conceptualization of mod-

ernism as a culture facilitates the exploration of our research object in space and time as the story of a community's institutional gestation, evolution, and decline. As an added benefit, such conceptualization addresses a core problem of the extant definitions of modernism, which tend to dilute it chronologically, since most artistic and intellectual practices that are customarily proposed as definition criteria neither begin nor end with modernism as a temporally and geographically circumscribed community. In this light, debates about Lawrence Sterne's, Edgar Allan Poe's, and Charles Baudelaire's "modernism avant la lettre" or about the status of Vladimir Nabokov's American writings (modernist vs. postmodernist), have little heuristic value for literary and cultural historians. Our goals are better served by limiting the inquiry to those artistic and intellectual events whose creation and reception were informed by a contemporary modernist interpretive community.

Let me illustrate this point with two stories—Anton Chekhov's "Mire" ("Tina," 1886), which appeared a decade before the emergence of modernist culture in Russia, and Isaac Babel's "Guy de Maupassant" (1932), written in the 1920s but published at the time of modernism's eradication in the USSR.[97] In "Mire," a Russian officer needs money to start a family and tries to collect a debt from an heiress to a Jewish industrialist. Succumbing to her sexual wiles, he is drawn into the woman's social circle and becomes unproductive in all senses: he drops his marital plans and adopts the "modern" ways of venal lucre and immorality. In this parable about modernity's emasculating effects, men lose the qualities distinguishing them from the women and the Jews of the (post-)Christian imagination—reason, creativity, spiritual transcendence. For Chekhov, civilizational decline is embodied by a predatory Jewess whose promiscuity breeds unproductivity in a thinly veiled allusion to syphilis. The same threat looms large in Babel's story, whose hero is a needy writer hired by a beguiling Jewess to edit her translations of Maupassant. Reprising many elements from "Mire," "Guy de Maupassant" ostensibly reverses the outcome of Chekhov's tale. Babel's hero triumphs over the Jewess, forcing her to acknowledge his artistic superiority and sexual prowess. But the fate of his literary idol, Maupassant, undone by syphilis, haunts the hero as he ponders the potential consequences of his intimate encounter with modernity incarnate.

Both texts resonate so strongly with the modernist horizon of expectations that one is tempted to use them as signposts for the lower and upper chronological limits of modernism in Russia proper. Syphilis was a stock figure of degeneration in modern European cultural mythology.[98] It expressed

the correlation of healthy civilizations with virile manhood—hence the fear of modernity as an emasculating force ("We are democratized and syphilized," quipped Baudelaire)—and benefited from the state of contemporary medicine, which used syphilis as an umbrella diagnosis for an array of illnesses.[99] At this time, syphilis was seen as a congenital condition—an intergenerational ill sapping a family in the same way the negative aspects of modernity sapped a nation—and an acquired disease spread by women, as objects of illicit desire, and by Jews, as the presumed runners of the sex trade racially predisposed to syphilis and to "female" psychopathologies.[100] The paradigmatic Others of the (post-)Christian imagination, women and Jews were cast as negative figures of modernity, often in one image of a destructive and exploitative Jewess (Salome, Judith, a courtesan, a whore). Such fusion of femininity, Jewishness, and syphilis was ubiquitous in the European discourse of degeneration that informed Chekhov's and Babel's symbolic practice.[101]

Modernism, however, invested syphilophobia with additional meanings absent from "Mire." Chekhov wrote his story for the semiotic community of the traditional intelligentsia whose perceived flaws he attacked, while repudiating "the destructive modern writers, who spread decadence in France" and whose Russian modernist disciples vainly tried to recruit Chekhov to their cause (see chapter 2).[102] His critique drew on positivist concerns for healthy heredity and fear of racial contamination, whose common denominator resided in the idea of the family as a bulwark against modernity's chaos.[103] Nothing could be further from the modernist yearning for apocalyptic renewal and hostility to the bourgeois ideals of domesticity and procreation (which Russian modernism, its female actors included, shared with pre-Stalinist Marxist culture).[104] Unlike its positivist rivals, Russian modernism was ambivalent about the mythical tropes of syphilis and female psychopathology. Members of the modernist community both dreaded and exalted these signs of decline, which functioned as portents of the desired eschaton and, by this token, of the ultimate and prestigious modernity of those marked by such signs. This attitude facilitated the job of modernism's foes, who cast its artistic and intellectual manifestations as the fruits of physical and mental affliction.[105] Attuned to the syphilophobia of the day, modernists nonetheless saw in syphilis a marker of creative genius, exemplified by Friedrich Nietzsche.[106] The legend of Nietzsche's balancing act between syphilitic brilliance and insanity informed Aleksandr Blok's self-image and posthumous legend. In Russian modernist culture, allusions to syphilis as the

cause of the poet's premature demise went hand in hand with the interpretation of his death as a result of spiritual asphyxiation in profane modernity, whereas, outside the modernist community, the rumors of Blok's syphilis had other connotations, helping to enlist the poet as a case study in degeneracy.[107]

Modernism imbibed the common phobias of the day, using them as categories of exclusion. To integrate into the Russian modernist community, women and Jews had to align themselves with its dominant models of cultural production and consumption, informed by misogyny and anti-Semitism.[108] Babel's "Guy de Maupassant" tested one such integration strategy, distancing the story's hero-narrator—the author's alter ego—from the Jewish and female Others, and catering thereby to the modernist horizon of expectations. Hence, the ambivalent treatment of syphilis framing Maupassant's genius and insanity in Babel's story.[109] Yet the story's belated publication in an obscure Soviet periodical limited its reception to the Stalinist system of aesthetic and philosophical coordinates. Exiled modernists, attentive to Babel's work (which an émigré critic likened to that of the "Ur-decadent" painter Félicien Rops), were unaware of this text.[110] In different historical circumstances, "Guy de Maupassant" could have become a significant event in Russian modernist culture. But the story's place in the history of Russian modernism is as fraught as that of "Mire." The lack of a modernist community informing the creation and reception of Chekhov's text and the inaccessibility of Babel's narrative to a modernist interpretive community render heuristically irrelevant the fact that both stories sport features commonly associated with modernism.

It follows that the conceptualization of modernism as a culture changes the ontological focus of its scholarly investigation. In the methodological approach I advocate, the vexed question of *what* is modernism and the attendant concern with sorting authors and texts into modernist and nonmodernist categories, according to fixed sets of criteria, take a back seat to other questions: *Where* and *when* is modernism, whose geography and chronology as an interpretive community bear directly on the taxonomy of authors and artifacts? Such mapping of modernism as a self-conscious community in geographical space and historical time strikes me as a prerequisite for any inquiry into modernism as a cultural phenomenon. That is why I have opted for cartography as this book's controlling metaphor.

I contend that our spatial and temporal charts of Russian modernism need redrawing. Literature has received much scholarly attention of late as a cognitive tool for mapping the world, for example, in the writings of Franco

Moretti and, more specific to modernist studies, in Andrew Thacker's exploration of the "geography of modernism."[111] But there has emerged no comparable focus on the cognitive mapping of literary and larger cultural processes by their students, as if the mental maps generated by critics and scholars were self-evident and unproblematic. Like geographic cartography—both a scientific tool and a device for imposing mythical, ideological, metaphysical, and other meanings on physical space in historical time—the chronological and geographic charting of cultural expression is not an impartial exercise.[112] Our extant mental maps of the when and where of Russian modernism hail from the era when it was an aesthetic and ideological battleground whose spatiality and temporality were codified in deliberately biased ways. Today, this partisan codification continues to shape our perception and evaluation of modernism as a cultural phenomenon.

In a stock-taking essay about the first existential crisis of Russian modernism accompanying the community's precipitous expansion after 1905, Aleksandr Blok compared the ephemeral faction of the "Symbolists," with which he identified, to geographic explorers sailing across "the sea of life and art" toward strange shores, surrounded by enemies and guided by the memory of "our native land." The poet then cast his reflections in "The Contemporary State of Russian Symbolism" (1910) as "a Baedeker guide" for those who wished to travel in "our misty lands."[113] This cartographic metaphor needs extending to the rest of Russian modernist culture. Neither Blok's tentative Baedeker nor those proposed by the community's other members—like Andrei Belyi, who urged fellow modernists, in 1908, to use "the Nietzschean compass" in their exploratory journey to "the Dream land of Eternity"—are of much help to us today.[114] As I argue in chapters 2 and 3, the maps of Russian modernism we have inherited from our objects of research are as unreliable—thanks to the cartographers' partisan involvement in the life of the "misty lands" they charted—as the maps produced by latter-day critics and scholars, whose cartographic practices were skewed by other types of aesthetic, ideological, and methodological bias.

For example, students of modernism rarely take into account its geographic evolution. Modernism first emerged in Russia, as an interpretive community, in 1895–96, along the Moscow-Petersburg axis. By 1902, it sported a distinct institutional structure—a network of salons, social circles, artistic coteries, periodicals, and publishing houses—as well as a sustaining and uniting sense of purpose. Between 1905 and 1914, the community grew exponentially, spreading to other urban centers, from Kiev to Tiflis. Then it began

to contract, embarking on a westward migration as part of the larger exodus of the country's educated elites. In the early 1920s, Russian modernism shaped up along a new axis: Moscow-Berlin-Paris, with Berlin at its center. By 1925, the cultural community migrated farther west, finding its footing along the Moscow-Berlin-Prague-Paris axis, even as modernism was being extinguished in the USSR. By 1930, Paris became Russian modernism's center until the community's ultimate dispersal during the Second World War. Students of Russian modernism, however, lean heavily on the first forty years in its life (1890s–1930) and tend to limit their inquiry to Russia proper, often ignoring the life of Russian modernism abroad and truncating its story by a decade (see chapter 3).

So dire is the need for a comprehensive revision of Russian modernist cartography that even the toponymy of the "misty lands" under investigation is problematic. Like all scholarly endeavors, cultural history requires a metalanguage. But that language also shapes the direction of academic inquiry, serving the vested interests of its creators. As I argue in chapter 1, the metalanguage of Russian modernist studies has all too often relied on the terminology of modernism's original actors and foes, who diminished some and exaggerated other historical events to suit their partisan purposes. As a result, today's scholarly maps of Russian modernism's "misty lands" recall the medieval *mappae mundi* featuring fabulous creatures and mythical kingdoms and never meant as navigation charts. In contrast, our mental maps of Russian modernism serve as scholarly orientation tools. On these charts, the Leviathan, Minotaur, unicorns, and centaurs of old have been replaced by Futurism, Symbolism, Decadence, Acmeism, Constructivism, and so forth; and the Garden of Eden, that central feature of medieval cartography, is now variously called the Silver Age of Russian culture or, if such is the mapmaker's faith, the historical avant-garde.

To paraphrase Joseph Conrad's cartographic musings, Russian modernist studies have matured enough to put high on their agenda the revision of the "geography fabulous," elaborated by modernists in factional battles for artistic legitimacy, and of the "geography militant," deployed by the community's friends and foes, including Soviet ideologues and their émigré opponents, in the tug-of-war over the interpretation of modernist experience and its role in Russian cultural history. This revision will help us transform "the business of map-making," as Conrad put it, "into an honest occupation, registering the hard-won knowledge, but also in a scientific spirit recording [our] ignorance."[115] Such critical revision necessarily begins with naming the

field of inquiry and its constituent parts in ways that reduce rather than exacerbate the biases inherent in any scholarly investigation.

Maps, of course, are notorious for distorting topographic reality and historical facts even without a partisan agenda. In what Mark Monmonier calls "the cartographic paradox," maps tell white lies to present a useful two-dimensional picture of a complex world. Like scholars distilling a coherent literary-historical narrative from a chaotic literary process, cartographers select, simplify, displace, smoothen, enhance, and aggregate elements of reality to help the user see what needs to be seen on one of many maps possible for the same situation or the same data.[116] Our mental cartography of cultural phenomena works in similar ways. I would like to think of modernist studies as a historical atlas project generating a set of maps that offer mutually complementary and even contradictory charts, each focused on a different aspect of modernist experience, which they describe rather than try to pin down with a definition that misleadingly essentializes the abstract analytical tool dubbed "modernism."

Accordingly, this book will suggest some general mapping principles and contribute a few pages to Russian modernist culture's historical atlas, whose creation I envision as a long-term collective endeavor. Taken out of this larger context, my focus on modernism's interaction with Russia's other cultures of modernity (chapter 4) or on the economics of Russian modernism's cultural production and consumption (chapter 5) will no doubt strike some readers as artificial, schematic, and reductive. For this was my own sense as I wrote this book, constantly having to remind myself that such selectivity and simplification were precisely the point. By magnifying some aspects of the charted terrain at the expense of others, one produces a usable map for an aspect of a more complex reality.

It bears repeating that cartography is my book's controlling metaphor, not its conceptual framework. This metaphor conveniently sums up my methodological take on modernism as a cultural community. Like cartography, modernist studies can and should multiply analytical perspectives, approaching their research object with a more open and creative mind-set. Once the temporal and spatial outlines of Russian modernist culture are revised (see chapters 2 and 3), we can apply to our object of investigation a series of thematic filters that bring into focus some aspects of modernist experience while necessarily downplaying others. These filters need not be limited to aesthetics and philosophy. For example, as Abram Reitblat and Mark Von Hagen point out, students of Russian modernism have largely ig-

nored its sociology, which begs for scholarly attention.[117] Modernist studies, in fact, are an ideal place for an integrative mode of historical inquiry that draws on an array of disciplines, since modernism itself is an integrative mode by virtue of being not just an artistic movement but a cultural formation with its own cognitive structure, sensibility, and practices in every sphere of life.[118]

I cannot but agree, then, with Gabriel Josipovici that there is no "true story of modernism" but rather a multiplicity of stories, none of which can be told as a linear succession of significant events.[119] This is because the significance of an event depends on the thematic filter through which we examine a national modernist culture. No story can do justice to life's complexity. The description of cultural processes is no exception to this truism. Like cartography, which tells white lies about reality in order to produce usable maps, students of modernism must rely on selection, simplification, enhancement, and other mapping tools in order to tell many complementary, and often contradictory, stories about their object of investigation. Each story, or map, differs in accordance with the thematic filter generating it, making visible some actors, practices, and events while obfuscating others, even though all such filters are applied to the same material circumscribed in concrete historical time and geographic space.

This is what I propose to do in my book. After a critical revision, in the first three chapters, of the terminology and mental cartography of Russian modernism, I apply to its newly named and outlined "misty lands" two of the many possible thematic filters—those that appeal the most to my intellectual curiosity thanks to their potential to yield maps that help us see more clearly in Russian modernist culture.

Cultural Spaces and Their Travelers

Almost two decades after the appearance of Blok's "Baedeker," Vladislav Khodasevich deplored the inadequate mental cartography of Russian modernism and the resultant taxonomic dilemmas of the culture's current and future historians: "Who is 'fully' a Symbolist? Who is 'partly,' or 'not at all'? Opinions vary and no clear answers are out there, mostly because the classification principle is missing. I think, when it is finally found, 'pure' Symbolists will turn out to be very few in number. However, we will see many more people who, in one way or another, have been pulled into the Symbolist circle."[120] Unorthodox in its day, because dynamic and nonlinear, Khodasevich's conception of modernism—the term he increasingly favored, recoil-

ing from the methodological shortfalls of the Symbolist moniker (see chapter 1)—framed its history as a gravitational force field whose diverse actors were always on the move vis-à-vis the cultural community's magnetic core. Sixty years later, unaware of Khodasevich's reflections, the staunch Marxist Perry Anderson would unwittingly echo the anti-Soviet émigré's idea of modernism as a "cultural force field."[121] Khodasevich's vision was strikingly nonpartisan for a veteran modernist still actively involved in the life of the notoriously factious community. Rising above the perennial quarrel about the border separating "modernists" from "others," Khodasevich may have drawn on similar spatial models developed to describe the intelligentsia—Russian modernism's progenitor.

Historian Pavel Miliukov pioneered the spatial model of the intelligentsia in 1910. Imagining this semiotic community as two concentric circles, he designated the intelligentsia's inner circle as the locus of cultural creativity and the outer one as its target audience ("the educated class"). His schema allowed for porousness between formations in the Russian field of cultural production. Miliukov insisted on the fluidity of boundaries between the intelligentsia and its designated bourgeois foil, casting them both as analytical abstractions nonexistent in a "pure state."[122] In 1926, literary critic Dmitrii Mirskii pushed this schema further, without acknowledging the intellectual debt he owed to his ideological foe. In Mirskii's model, the intelligentsia formed three concentric circles. The outer one housed "all the educated and professional classes"; the middle consisted of a "section of these classes [. . .] actively interested in political and social issues"; whereas the core was composed of political radicals sporting "a great variety of opinion." Mirskii described this core as "a sort of magnetic pole toward which the majority [of the intelligentsia] were attracted."[123] Neither author elaborated on the rapport between the intelligentsia and its Marxist and modernist offshoots. But Mirskii, then part of the Russian modernist community, soon proposed an aesthetic and intellectual hierarchy of Russia's minority cultures of modernity, placing modernism above "the Chekhovian intelligentsia and soulless revolutionary parties."[124] Both schemas may have informed Khodasevich's vision of modernism as a gravitational field coexisting with other such fields within the larger national space for cultural production, dissemination, and consumption.

Be that as it may, Aleksandr Blok's "Baedeker" take on modernist culture in terms of spatial movement—including travel, navigation, and discovery—had a long life. Recalling his friend's essay, and privy to the spatial metaphor

of modernism thanks to his previous involvement in a circle that had styled itself after the Argonauts of Greek mythology, Andrei Belyi cast his own career as a group exploratory journey across unfamiliar lands and seas.[125] To take another example, soon after the publication of Khodasevich's essay, a group of Russian modernists in Paris organized a charitable ball styled as an imaginative and imaginary exploratory voyage. The promotional leaflet featured Giorgio de Chirico's drawing, commissioned for the event, in which a couple of armchair travelers, or "Navigators," contemplated a map. The flip side sported a Francophone synopsis, probably penned by the poet Boris Poplavskii, promising a Jules Verne–inspired trip to the moon, with stops "in many countries, climes, and states of mind." Intended as a show of strength on the part of a flagging modernist faction, the Jules Verne Ball (12 April 1929) ended in a financial fiasco due to poor attendance.[126] The failure was one of many signs that a historical stage in the life of Russian and transnational modernist culture had come to a close (see chapter 3). The same cannot be said about the metaphor of exploratory travel, which continued to stand Russian modernists in good stead as a trope of self-description.

Capitalizing on this tradition, I would like to model Russian modernist culture as a space with a core and a periphery. But it would be wrong to imagine its core as an immutable set of ideas, values, and practices. Russian modernism changed so much over its lifetime that the main justification for inscribing its story within a roughly fifty-year period resides in the sense of aesthetic and intellectual continuity professed by the community's self-identified members at all historical stages of its existence and despite its endemic factiousness. Each wave of artists and intellectuals contributed to the renewal of values, ideas, and practices forming the core of the Russian modernist community at any given moment. Z. G. Mints was the first to propose this dynamic model of Russian modernism, albeit on a more restricted chronological and geographic scale than the one I advocate in this book.[127]

As I argue in chapters 2 and 3, one can designate several distinct stages (early, high, and late) in the history of Russian modernism, each marked by altered core values, ideas, and practices. Pushed from their central position in modernist culture, older values, ideas, and practices continued to coexist with newly dominant ones for as long as their carriers remained within the modernist interpretive community, albeit on its periphery. Few actors in modernist culture embraced the full scope of its core values and practices at any given time, wreaking havoc in our taxonomical assumptions about their position regarding this or that modernist "ism." As a result, no author

Les Navigateurs
VENDREDI 12 AVRIL
BAL
GRAND GALA TRAVESTI
JULES VERNE
organisé par la
corporation des ARTISTES RUSSES
au profit de sa caisse de secours
A LA SALLE BULLIER
31, avenue de l'observatoire
vendredi 12 avril 1929
à 10 heures du soir
après avoir été rêvé, lu et vécu, Jules Verne doit être dansé. cet hommage lui était dû depuis longtemps : danses enfantines, mécaniques et, principalement sous-marines. les orchestres (grandes natures mortes animées) seront disposés à tous les étages, l'un d'eux se déplacera dans l'atmosphère au moyen d'un procédé pressenti par Jules Verne mais inutilisé à ce temps. enfin il y aura un orchestre spécial (situé dans la quatrième dimension) pour les esprits de la nature et les revenants en chapeau haut de forme. pendant ce temps, au-dessus du bal passeront les étoiles sonores, grands fleuves roses de direction inconnue. plusieurs horreurs seront commises publiquement, notamment : une femme sera transformée en squelette électrique et un homme mangé par un ange en commençant par les extrémités. dans le public : socrate en caleçon rayé, l'obélisque de louqsor pris d'une débauche lamentable, la tour eiffel en costume 1900 et parfumée au patchouli, marcel proust, complètement chauve et souriant. nota : tous ceux qui, s'étant présentés au contrôle, pourront réciter par cœur "a la recherche du temps perdu", seront récompensés par un buste de Jules Verne en chocolat au lait. soleil voyageur, panama du monde astral, Jules Verne, revenant de la lune en uniforme complet, écrira publiquement un roman de 10.000 pages en n'utilisant que des points d'exclamation ! ensuite, il sera coupé en deux et son organisme distribué à l'assistance (publique) sous forme de fleurs lumineuses. parti de la terre à 10 heures du soir, le bal débarquera à la lune à 5 heures du matin sous le fracas discontinu de ses 4 moteurs orchestres. plusieurs pays, climats et états d'esprit seront visités en passant, notamment : celui de l'extase immobile, celui de gérard de nerval (vénus), celui de l'alcool solaire et lunaire, celui de l'outrage aux mœurs, celui de cocagne. la salle sera décorée exclusivement par des enfants nés entre 1870 et 1929. tous les visiteurs auront la tête coupée au contrôle, laquelle leur sera aimablement rendue à la sortie contre un remboursement dérisoire (la maison ne répond pas des objets échangés). machines complètement inconnues, chantantes et dansantes à volonté, à noter : femmes mécaniques en location, coups de pied au derrière complètement gratuits par charlie chaplin en personne. avis aux amateurs : 100 corps astraux tout nus à enlever de suite. évanouissement général et facultatif, travesti presque obligatoire.
PRIX D'ENTRÉE : 30 FRANCS
on ne répond pas des tables retenues, encore moins de celles qui ne le seront pas
BILLETS EN VENTE : dans les galeries de peinture, les librairies d'art, les grands cafés de montparnasse et de montmartre, les agences de location et à l'entrée de la salle.

An invitation advertising the charitable masked ball, "Bal Jules Verne" (12 April 1929), organized by the Union of Russian Artists in Paris. The front of the prospectus features Giorgio de Chirico's drawing "The Navigators." The French text on the back is attributed to Boris Poplavskii. Giorgio de Chirico, [drawing for the program of the Russian artists' masked ball in Paris], 1929. © Estate of Giorgio de Chirico/SODRAC (2017).

or personality occupied a static position in the cultural space of Russian modernism, where doctrinal "purity" was a fleeting quality contingent on a traveler's changing position with regard to the community's evolving radical core.

Take Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, whose literary career spanned the entire chronological and geographic scope of Russian modernist history. Merezhkovskii lost his central position in modernist culture after 1905, written off by its radicals as an intellectual fossil. Yet he remained, in Valerii Briusov's words, "part of the community," which continued to view Merezhkovskii's writings as related to the sensibility and values of "any 'aesthete' or 'modern-

ist.'"[128] Briusov's statement shows that, already in the 1900s, modernists imagined Russian cultural life as a conglomerate of interpretive communities. Hence Blok's desire to write a Baedeker guide to the "misty lands" of modernism and Khodasevich's spatial conceptualization of modernist history. Merezhkovskii's trajectory echoes that of other pioneers of Russian modernism—Liubov' Gurevich, Nikolai Minskii, Akim Volynskii, Zinaida Gippius. Raised in the intelligentsia culture, all of them rebelled against some of its philosophical and aesthetic premises while retaining others. As a result, they found themselves at the center of nascent modernist culture for about a decade. Pushed ever further to modernism's periphery by the up-and-coming cohorts whose practices they rejected, these veterans nevertheless remained within the community as cultural creators, mediators, and consumers.[129]

The movement of actors inside the cultural space of Russian modernism ran parallel to the movement of people between rival cultural formations. Lidiia Ginzburg saw this cross-cultural commerce as a result of evolving aesthetic and philosophical positions and professional opportunities pushing individuals to "cross from one value system into another" in search of self-realization.[130] Just as Georg Lukács traded Germanophone modernist culture for its Marxist rival, earning the posthumous title of "traitor to modernism" (Bronner), many Russian artists and intellectuals crossed cultural boundaries, wreaking havoc in our taxonomical assumptions.[131] Maxim Gorky, for instance, was initially accepted in the Russian modernist community, largely on the basis of shared mythology, and felt more affinity to the modernist sensibility than to that of the traditional intelligentsia.[132] As a result, his subsequent crossing into Marxist culture created lasting ambiguities, sapping the writer's canonical image in Soviet historiography as a pioneer of Socialist Realism.[133] If modernists began to treat Gorky as a "stranger" around 1904, deriding as fake his continued engagement with their community's ethical and philosophical concerns and artistic practices, other contemporary commentators insisted on conflating Gorky with "the scum of 'decadence' and 'modernism' " (Burenin) long after his move to Marxism.[134] It was only in the mid-1910s that a nonpartisan observer, Semën Vengerov, previously adamant about Gorky's "affinity to 'new [literary] currents,' " finally conceded that Gorky did not fit into the "category of 'modernism.' "[135]

Gorky was not an exception. Many authors broke the boundaries, some repeatedly, between various formations in the Russian field of cultural production: Leonid Andreev, Georgii Chulkov, Il'ia Erenburg, R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik, Andrei Platonov, Mikhail Prishvin, Aleksei Remizov, Boris Savinkov,

Dmitrii Mirskii, Aleksei Tolstoi, to cite but a few.[136] These travelers across cultural spaces are often disregarded in Russian modernist studies as not "pure" enough to make the taxonomical cut in the definition-centered vision of our research object. A similar problem exists in Anglo-American scholarship. Michael Levenson has decried the inattention of students of modernism to George Bernard Shaw, a staunch defender of "new art." Levenson has sought to remedy such critical reductiveness by rethinking modernism as a "heterogeneous minority culture."[137] Going a step further, I submit that we ask the wrong question when we query, "Is so-and-so a modernist?" This inquiry presumes the existence of a definition essentializing modernism as an objective yardstick for classification. And since no consensual definition is available or indeed possible, one scholar's "modernist" is all too often another's "realist," to cite one problematic classification principle (see chapter 2). In contrast, if we agree that modernism is an analytical abstraction—a tool helping cultural historians to speak about a self-identified interpretive community—then the above question should be qualified with the queries, "When and to what extent is so-and-so a modernist?"

Within the conceptual framework advocated in this book, the "modernist" marker does not refer to immutable qualities characterizing authors, ideas, practices, and artifacts. Instead, it designates the appurtenance of individuals—cultural producers, mediators, and consumers—to a self-conscious, chronologically and geographically circumscribed interpretive community, and the meanings given by that community to some ideas, practices, and artifacts, but not to others. Calling an author, a text, a practice, or an idea modernist, I signal its place in Russian and transnational modernist culture at a given historical moment—a place that is most often fleeting, because no idea or practice is historically exclusive to modernism, and few individuals and artifacts retain their central position in a national modernist community throughout its existence. The latter fact becomes especially obvious in light of the recent attention of students of Russian modernism to its noncanonical cultural producers and, equally important, to its public, which has lately become a major scholarly focus.[138]

Rather than split hairs in sterile debates about who is a modernist, we would do better to heed the diversity of actors, many previously excluded from modernist studies, who come into focus as we change thematic filters in the process of mapping the cultural space of Russian modernism. We have habitually placed outside modernist history a number of authors who embraced—at various stages of their careers and to different extents—some

aesthetic, intellectual, or social practices of the Russian modernist community, keeping aloof from others. Such exclusion, while methodologically necessary in order to circumscribe the object of research, may tell more about our own biases as scholars than about the authors and texts we study.[139] Consider Ivan Bunin, whose oeuvre has been read as antithetical to modernism.[140] A careful examination of Bunin's trajectory in the Russian field of cultural production problematizes his stock image as a poster anti-modernist and heir to the nineteenth-century intelligentsia's literary canon.[141]

Going by the extant definitions of modernism, one should exclude Bunin's "realist" and "traditional" writings from the purview of modernist studies. This impression is solidified by Bunin's intermittent alliances with anti-modernist factions (e.g., Gorky's Znanie) and his record of anti-modernist pronouncements. Yet his first poetic collection, *Listopad* (1901), was published by the modernist house Skorpion, whose milieu Bunin frequented for a while, and where he was accepted, albeit grudgingly and condescendingly, as a figure from the periphery of modernist culture. And the story repeats itself after Bunin leaves Gorky's faction, in 1906, becoming a contributor to the modernist journals *Pereval*, *Fakely*, and *Zolotoe runo*. Accepted in modernism's less factionalist circles, Bunin was rejected as not "pure" enough by the militants at the culture's core (to wit, the publishing house Sirin).[142] It is no wonder that contemporaries struggled to define Bunin's mercurial place, now excluding him from modernism, now listing him along with its prominent Russian and foreign representatives.[143] The fact remains, however, that during his long artistic career Bunin experimented with a variety of styles and themes in poetry and prose, shuttling in and out of the modernist community in sync with his changing views and in pursuit of professional advantages. At times, he openly distanced himself from modernist culture, at other times, he subscribed to its intellectual, aesthetic, and social practices, as witnessed by his unorthodox living arrangements modeled on the modernist rebellion against *byt* and the "bourgeois" institution of family.[144]

Does all this make Bunin a productive object of inquiry for modernist studies? The answer depends on the thematic filter we apply to the modernist cultural space. Bunin is surely part of several stories one can tell about modernism in its relation to Russian society at large, to the Russian cultural market, to the changing demographics of readership, and to cultural institutions in the Russian Empire and emigration. In all these stories, the question of whether Bunin is a modernist becomes irrelevant in contrast to another query, this one about Bunin's evolving position vis-à-vis modernist culture

at its various historical stages. The latter question broadens our understanding of Bunin's artistic and intellectual profile even as it makes us appreciate Russian modernism's complexity as a cultural formation.

Although it deals with modernism as a culture, this book will give most of its attention to literature and its producers and consumers. In this way, I will address a long-standing bias in modernist studies unwittingly summed up by Gabriel Josipovici: "It is in the domain of art rather than literature [. . .] that the most interesting and sophisticated explorations of modernism are to be found [. . .] I think this has to do with the fact that literature is too embroiled with the world [. . .] Painting, on the other hand, is 'purer' than literature, so that one can see more clearly what is at stake in painterly choices."[145] Such avoidance of the art of letters is common in Russian modernist studies, where one can devote the bulk of an encyclopedia entry on modernism to the visual arts or write a chapter on modernism for a history of Russian literature almost entirely devoted to drama and theater.[146] Verbal expression resists, even more than other art forms, the reductive premises of the definition-centered approach intent on looking for "pure" examples validating this or that list of taxonomical criteria. While no national modernist culture can be reduced to verbal art alone, downplaying its role is equally erroneous, especially when it comes to Russia's traditionally logocentric field of cultural production, where literature's creators and consumers constituted the backbone of the modernist community and the driving force behind the modernist sensibility. The fact that literary life is "too embroiled with the world" actually plays to its advantage in the study of modernism as a culture. Literature opens our inquiry to thematic areas beyond such traditional foci of modernist studies as aesthetics and philosophy. This alone is reason enough to practice a reverse elision by emphasizing the literary process in a book that advocates for a new cultural cartography of modernism—not as a single map featuring our research object in a "pure state" but as a historical atlas giving an account of modernism as a social phenomenon with many facets, or stories, each deserving a map of its own.

As a literary scholar, I feel strongly about reversing the tendency of Russian modernist studies to relegate literature to auxiliary roles. But this book also takes me out of my disciplinary comfort zone, downplaying such familiar analytical procedures as the close reading of artistic and critical texts, interpretive surveys of bodies of writing, and the construction of cohesive literary-historical narratives. Having authored my share of extended analyses of modernist texts, I am willing to expose myself to the charge of super-

ficial generalization, if that is the price to pay for venturing a systematic methodological revision of an academic field struggling to translate its growing body of empirical data into a qualitatively new vision of the object of study. Adding yet another series of close readings will not remedy the underlying problem. If the multiplicity of extant case studies has not amounted to a paradigm shift in the field, it is because this mass of information has not been synthesized within a conceptual framework. My book looks for such a synthesis, while questioning the field's basic premises and admitting that no definitive solutions are in sight. That is why its title is *In Search of Russian Modernism*.

I have envisaged this monograph as a reflection on the methodological problems inherent in the investigation of cultural history, with Russian modernism as a fruitful case study. My ultimate goal is not so much to propose new solutions to stubborn methodological issues as to explore a number of oft-ignored interpretive venues, opening an overdue debate about the field of Russian modernist studies, which needs a thorough methodological revision. If this localized effort ultimately contributes to the critical reexamination of current scholarly approaches to transnational modernism, the way the new modernist studies have done on Anglo-American material, I will feel all the more gratified by the outcome of my experiment in cultural cartography.

1 The Toponymical Labyrinth of Russian Modernist Culture

There is no consensus about a suitable name for the historical phenomenon that I choose to call here "Russian modernism." Nor is there much terminological consensus regarding that culture's constituent artistic and intellectual practices. There has been no lack of tentative labels. All of them, however, fail as toponymical markers that should orient us in the modernist terrain, contrary to Iurii Tynianov's unrequited wish that "each term of literary theory be a specific outcome of concrete facts" rather than an empty shell "forcibly 'filled' with 'fitting' exemplars picked on the extra- and supra-literary heights of metaphysical aesthetics."[1] Surveying Russian modernist studies seventy years after Tynianov's 1924 outcry, Roger Keys still rued the field's "terminological uncertainty."[2] As of this writing, we are not any closer to consensual terminology describing Russian modernist culture.

Vladimir Markov's onomastic travails foreshadowed our predicament. The émigré pioneer of Russian modernist studies first broached the issue of terminology in 1954, qualifying as "expedient" and "reluctant" his recourse to such historical cognomens as Acmeism, Futurism, and Symbolism. For Markov, Acmeism "bore little meaning," Futurism "did not at all express [the movement's] main idea," and Symbolism "conveyed the trend's philosophy and main technical device" but was too typologically narrow for the period it denoted (1890s–1900s).[3] Subsequently, in *Russian Futurism* (1968), Markov gave up on clear distinctions between his titular subject's numerous manifestations, presenting Futurism as a "complex conglomeration" of "virtually all those [artists] who considered themselves 'modern' at that time." The Futurist label thus came to designate "a postsymbolist movement in Russian poetry of 1910–1930 which, roughly, put under the same roof all avant-garde forces."[4]

With this solution in mind—Symbolism and Futurism as two stages of

"modern" Russian letters—Markov turned to the writings of Mikhail Kuzmin, only to realize the flaws of his taxonomy. Kuzmin "rejected Futurism, while being an avant-gardist in his own right" and "fusing the Symbolist tradition with the avant-garde." Yet Markov knew that Kuzmin did not fit into the notion of Symbolism in the eyes of contemporary and later critics. When Markov finally stopped trying to match Kuzmin with a label, citing "difficulties inherent in Kuzmin's literary classification," his onomastic quest took a new turn. The scholar replaced the historical self-appellations of his research objects with more generic terms that he then applied to the entire Russian field of cultural production, from the turn of the century to the Second World War, splitting the period into two phases—"so-called 'modernism' and so-called 'avant-garde.'"[5]

This solution was also problematic because it raised modernism and the avant-garde to the status of period terms, although the modernist aesthetic and sensibility never dominated Russian cultural life, even in the peak years of their visibility (roughly, 1906–27).[6] In this context, "modernism"—which I set in the lowercase to distinguish the cultural community thus denoted from the historical self-appellations of its constituents—cannot be a *period* term. And, as for Markov's second term, the "avant-garde," it is additionally fraught by its implicit evaluative thrust that makes its referent too fluid, because contingent on evolving historical circumstances: ever since the rise of anti-normative romantic poetics, each stage in European artistic life has had its avant-garde, making the label's utility as a period marker dubious.

But even as a period term, Markov's "so-called 'modernism' " was slow to gain traction in Russian studies because, on one hand, the term was being used by Soviet critics as a meaningless expletive and, on the other hand, modernism seemed out of place in the Russian context thanks to the term's semantics in Anglo-American academic discourse. If the demise of Soviet rhetoric has freed the modernist epithet from derogatory connotations, its Anglophone usage remains a stumbling block for Russianists. Until the rise of the new modernist studies, Anglo-American scholarship codified modernism narrowly—as a set of specific practices in the 1910s–20s—excluding decades of European art and thought. Furthermore, Anglophone scholars treat modernism as an anachronistic term whose first targeted application in English—Robert Graves and Laura Riding's *Survey of Modernist Poetry*—came only in 1927, failing to gain currency even then. In 1932, Ezra Pound still spoke about a "movement to which no name had been given," whereas Edmund Wilson grouped authors as different as W. B. Yeats, James Joyce,

and Gertrude Stein under the rubric of Symbolism (*Axel's Castle*, 1931). Two decades later, Wilson still disparaged the rising popularity of modernism—"a filthy disgusting word," "an obscene term"—as the marker of a nascent academic field.[7]

Widening our frame of reference hardly solves the issue of terminological transferability. French literary history, for instance, has never taken to modernism as a generic label or a movement name.[8] In French academic discourse, this term is primarily associated with a reformist movement within the Catholic Church. Furthermore, since the pioneering interwar surveys of "modern" French literature by Albert Thibaudet and René Lalou, there has been no consensus regarding an onomastic umbrella for French artistic "isms." Thibaudet used the term "modernism" once in a volume of six hundred pages. Lalou, seeking a unifying name for cognate literary practices that had emerged since 1870, resorted to Symbolism, while decrying the moniker's inadequacy. Symptomatically, Maurice Samuels prefaces his essay in *The Cambridge Companion to European Modernism* with a disclaimer about going "against the grain of traditional French cultural history by linking [. . .] together under the common heading of modernism" the many "isms" spun by French writers from the 1880s through the 1950s.[9]

It is, then, a peculiarity of Russian cultural history that the term "modernism" is not any more anachronistic than other appellations associated with the period from the 1890s to 1940. The use of "modernism" as a generic alternative to extant metadescriptive labels became widespread in Russian critical discourse in the 1900s. This idiosyncrasy derived from the fact that the country's field of cultural production was shaken up, in 1905, by a revolution that triggered the first existential crisis of the modernist community. This crisis manifested itself, among other things, in the community's sharp expansion, bringing about sweeping intellectual and aesthetic realignments and the concomitant taxonomical and terminological confusion. In this context, a blanket label like modernism gave a welcome respite from the semantic erosion of old "isms" and the mushrooming of new ones.

As Z. G. Mints observes, the fact that intense onomastic activity, symptomatic of heightened self-consciousness, accompanied Russian modernism from its inception is evidence enough of the qualitative difference of "new" art and thought from their precursors and rivals.[10] One finds no comparable terminological anxiety and discord before the 1890s. It is, in fact, possible to imagine the entire lifespan of Russian modernist culture as an unbroken process of terminological reflection and rivalry. And while such

continuous clash of "isms" has contributed to present "terminological uncertainty" in modernist studies, a historical survey of this onomastic process reveals the full range of meanings vested in modernism as a Russian critical term, as well as its methodological utility with respect to other terms at our disposal.

Ultimately, such a survey sheds light on the thorny issues of modernist taxonomy. Accepting as our starting point that the metalanguage historically applied to and in modernist circles did not always reflect or adequately describe actual events, we will shape our inquiry accordingly. Instead of attempting yet another definition of Symbolism and the taxonomy of its exponents (say, as distinct from Decadence), I will focus on the *functional utility* of the Russian modernist community's protean and polysemous terminology. The goal is to put critical distance between scholars and their research object, whose self-description "may not be the most reliable metalanguage for scholarly inquiry," to cite Mints's careful understatement. Such distance allows for a bird's-eye view of the factional fray of Russian modernism, exposing continuities and discontinuities in its legitimating practices, in which terminology played a key role.[11]

Early Russian Modernism and Its "Isms"

Most names applied in fin-de-siècle Russia to nascent intellectual and artistic trends came from abroad, as in the cases of Decadence, Symbolism, and modernism. Some were calqued: *sovremennost'* and *sovremennyi* were derived from "modernity" (*la modernité*, *Die Modernität*) and "modern" (*moderne*, *Die Moderne*); *novoe/sovremennoe iskusstvo* harked to *l'art nouveau*, "modern/new style," *Der Jugendstil*. France was, by far, the most important supplier of "isms." Foremost of these was Decadence, whose popularity in Russia was cemented by the resonance of Max Nordau's treatise *Degeneration* (1892).

Before reaching Russia, however, the term underwent polemical reappropriation. Its initial dismissive connotations, targeting younger French writers in the 1880s, were countered in alternative usage, in which Decadence functioned as a self-appellation by the very objects of mockery who proudly flaunted the abusive term (e.g., Anatole Baju's review *Le Décadent*, 1886–89). The label's recoding was facilitated by its association with Charles Baudelaire's aesthetic legacy, codified in Théophile Gautier's preface to the 1868 edition of *Les Fleurs du mal*. Reprinted in the book's standard edition until 1916, this preface assimilated Baudelaire to late Roman "decadence," under-

stood as the summit of cultural and intellectual refinement whose carriers had exclusive access to ineffable sensations and novel ideas.[12] Budding French writers could thus proudly call themselves Decadents. As a result, in French usage, the epithet Decadence conveyed both anti-modernist scorn and ostentatious modernist irony at the expense of cultural fogies. In any case, it held little meaning outside the context of current critical debates, working as a space filler for lack of a better epithet describing new artistic trends.[13]

The year 1886 saw the birth of an alternative term, Symbolism, which Jean Moréas applied to poets hitherto known as Decadents (René Ghil, Stéphane Mallarmé, Henri de Régnier, Paul Verlaine, etc.). The new tag was promptly canonized in the journal *Le Symboliste*. But Moréas's haphazard explanation of Symbolism, which grafted Baudelaire's intuitive quest for "correspondences" between material and spiritual realms onto Verlaine's striving for poetic "music," failed to make a case for the Symbolist school. His manifesto essentially boiled down to the rejection of the Decadent label in a self-serving attempt to stake a place in the crowded literary field. Moréas's terminological distinction left an impression that Decadence referred to a fixed set of ideas and practices proper to a specific group and that, in contrast, authors dubbed Symbolists accepted that name and formed a group of their own. Neither was the case. Many newly designated Symbolists, Verlaine and Mallarmé included, scoffed at the term and concept as useless fictions. To make matters worse, other contenders to the title arose in unlikely places. Writing in *La Décadence*, a journal launched in response to Moréas's manifesto, Ghil claimed to be the true voice of Symbolism. In the public opinion, meanwhile, the terms became interchangeable.[14]

This onomastic mess was the butt of all jokes in the satirical weekly *Le Moderniste illustré* (1889), whose facetious manifesto proposed to call *le moderniste* any dandy akin to the hero of J.-K. Huysmans's novel *À Rebours* (*Against Nature*, 1884)—not least because Huysmans was rumored to have coined the neologism *modernisme*, in his essay "Salon de 1879," with reference to excessive fancy for all things "modern."[15] Picked up by a journal of literary neophytes, *La Revue moderniste* (1884–86), the term soon evolved into a signifier for all "superior manifestations of contemporary artistic activity," beginning with Impressionism in painting and Naturalism in literature.[16] The team of *La Revue moderniste* sank into oblivion. Yet Huysmans's presence on its pages did suggest that the putative author of the epithet "modernism" did not object to its recoding as a positive umbrella term for

anything one liked in contemporary art. Characteristically, this usage was overshadowed by the more partisan interpretation of "new art" in *Le Décadent*, *Le Symboliste*, and *La Décadence*—journals launched concurrently with the demise of *La Revue moderniste*. It was probably this contrast of modernism's pompous insipidity to the obscure battle cries of Symbolism and Decadence that made the first term expedient for the satirical purposes of *Le Moderniste illustré*.

Be that as it may, modernism never took root in the French critical lexicon. The terminological situation mocked in *Le Moderniste illustré* spun out of control by 1891, as the expounders of Symbolism, Moréas included, abandoned it for the sake of other "isms." In 1900, Gustave Kahn called himself "the last Symbolist." But unlike Decadence—a label too axiologically charged for neutral use—Symbolism received a second lease on life, in the late 1900s, as a byword for "modern idealism" running from Baudelaire to Bergson.[17] Later, interwar French critical thought made Symbolism the marker of an anachronistically constructed movement linking Nerval and Baudelaire to Rimbaud, Verlaine, and Mallarmé, and all of them to Péguy, Proust, Gide, Claudel, and Valéry, although none of them identified with the Symbolist epithet in any meaningful way.[18] In the words of one historian, in French critical usage, the Symbolist moniker has always been "a vague term designating a missing movement."[19] In sum, when the French terms, coined in the 1880s, reached Russia, they were so ambiguous that one could fill them with any content.[20]

At that time, Russians already had an epithet for recent literary trends—*novoromantizm* (new romanticism)—stressing the romantic pedigree of the modernist sensibility. In the 1880s-90s, the label of *novoromantizm* was applied to a range of authors, from Gorky to Minskii.[21] But it was overshadowed by imported terms. Witness Valerii Briusov's invocation of *novoromanticheskaia shkola* (the new romantic school) as related to, yet distinct from, Symbolism in the second issue of his almanac *Russkie simvolisty* (Russian Symbolists, 1894).[22] Subsequent intermittent applications of romanticism to "new art" reflected fluctuating terminological discontent and functioned as a fallback option for the times when other terms seemed especially inadequate, even compared to the notoriously elusive romantic soubriquet.

In 1907, for instance, in the midst of the first major crisis of modernist culture, Modest Gofman proposed to replace Decadence and Symbolism with romanticism as a more inclusive and meaningful name.[23] He found an ally in Semën Vengerov, who used neoromanticism interchangeably with

modernism, preferring the former term.[24] Taking Vengerov's cue, Viktor Zhirmunskii gave a rationale to this usage in *German Romanticism and Modern Mysticism* (1914)—an academic thesis that enjoyed broad attention, because it promised a solution to the modernist community's terminological and taxonomical quandaries.[25] Recourse to (neo-/new) romanticism as a signifier of the modernist sensibility then abated, only to flare up in the 1920s, during the second existential crisis of Russian modernism. In 1924, Georgii Adamovich spoke about "the late romantic whirlwind called Decadence, modernism, and other equally artificial names." He was seconded by Boris Pasternak, who envisioned "new art," from Symbolism to Futurism, as an outgrowth of German romanticism.[26] Such usage was embraced by cultural historians, Zhirmunskii included, as a tool for conceptualizing "the Russian literary period, roughly from 1890 to 1920, dubbed 'Decadence,' 'modernism,' and most often 'Symbolism' " (Cheshikhin).[27]

We still find this usage in the early 1930s, in the writings of émigré and Soviet scholars alike.[28] It even cropped up in the suppressed tenth volume of the *Literary Encyclopaedia*, which listed neoromanticism as a synonym of Decadence, Symbolism, and modernism.[29] But the book's censure was symptomatic of the Stalinist rewriting of literary history, which codified the period from the century's turn to 1917 as that of the confrontation between two romanticisms—one bourgeois Decadent, another revolutionary and realist. In this teleological vision of the literary process, revolutionary romanticism defeated its foe to become a pillar of Socialist Realism.[30] For émigré intellectuals, Stalinist usage ruined romanticism and its derivatives as signifiers of the modernist sensibility, whereas, in Soviet scholarship, it permanently cast neoromanticism as a "completely false" terminological choice that provocatively suggested aesthetic and intellectual affinities between modernists and some precursors of Socialist Realism, Gorky above all.[31] As an onomastic option, then, (neo-/new) romanticism expired in the 1930s.

For all their fashionable appeal in the 1890s, the semantic ambiguity of Decadence and Symbolism explains the initial popularity of more intelligible turns of phrase containing qualifiers *novyi* (new) and *sovremennyi* (modern). We find early signs of this practice in Dmitrii Merezhkovskii's creed, *On the Reasons for the Decline and on the New Trends in Contemporary Russian Literature* (1892), which dubbed "the hitherto undefined and unacknowledged trend" *novoe iskusstvo* (new art). Merezhkovskii's concurrent book of verse, *Symbols* (1892), featured *novoe iskusstvo* in the title of a poem about Baudelaire's artistic progeny.[32] The epithet *novyi* soon evolved into a disambiguating

marker of nascent Russian modernist culture, and it was read as such by the foes of "new art."[33] Hence the name of Merezhkovskii's and Zinaida Gippius's journal, *Novyi put'* (New path, 1902–4), and the title of Gippius's first book of fiction, *Novye liudi* (New people, 1896). The epithet *novyi* was a clear favorite with early Russian modernists, who used it in many phraseological combinations: from the "new movement" (Vengerova) and "new school" (Briusov) to the "new quest" (Belyi), "new religion" (Ellis), and "new sensibility" (Berdiaev).[34] In 1895, Briusov expressed as follows his readiness to join Aleksandr Dobroliubov's modernist venture: "I will do my best on behalf of your journal, for it is devoted to the movement you call 'new' and I call 'Symbolism.' "[35]

By the late 1900s, the proliferation of modernist currents brandishing novelty as a trope of self-legitimation stripped the term of its disambiguating function. Witness the growing use of italics, quotes, and the auxiliary phrase "so-called" to stress the special meaning of the epithet "new."[36] But to no avail. In 1909, invoking "the new literary and artistic sensibility," Semën Vengerov recoiled from this formulation as vague and awkward, suggesting an alternative: "It could be called, for brevity's sake, 'modernism.' "[37] While the epithet "new," as a marker of modernist practices, was kept on life support by the force of phraseological inertia among veterans of early modernism (cf. Blok: "new Russian belles-lettres" [1921]; Zaitsev: "new literature" [1959]), it lost all disambiguating utility by the late 1900s.[38] In 1911, eager to distance his modernist cohort from its younger rivals, Andrei Belyi could find no better formula than to insist on "the end of the talented movement called 'new art' [*novoe iskusstvo*]."[39]

The epithet *sovremennyi* followed a similar trajectory. Rivaling *novyi* as a generic signifier of modernist art and thought, it was calqued on the rallying cry of the German literary cohort whose poetic anthology, *Moderne Dichtercharaktere* (1885), and journal, *Die Gesellschaft* ("an organ of the modern movement [*moderne Bewegung*]," 1885), inspired many imitations sporting the adjective *moderne*. In the late 1880s, the adjective begat a substantive, *die Moderne*, denoting modernist art and thought (unlike *la modernité*, whose broader social thrust was echoed in *die Modernität* and *sovremennost'*).[40] But the adjective's alternative derivation, *der Modernismus*, occasionally surfacing in German criticism, was overshadowed there by other terms. So much so that the Russian use of the term *modernizm* cannot be directly traced to a single foreign source, pace Liubov' Gurevich's complaint, in 1910, about modernism as that "tasteless and meaningless" epithet that is "constantly used of late in our periodical press, [and that] may have arrived from Ger-

many, where the same label—'die Moderne'—was assumed by a group of young writers [. . .] whereas in our usage, starting in the early twentieth century, this term has been applied to the most disparate writers, provided they are more or less 'fashionable,' and holds no conceptual significance."[41] Yet this was precisely the reason for the terminological popularity of modernism in Russia. As Gurevich, the former editor of the "modern" review *Severnyi vestnik*, noted in her essay, the labels Decadent and Symbolist lost, after 1905, what conceptual significance they had previously held. And one could not keep replacing them with attributes like *novyi* and *sovremennyi* indefinitely, since what had been "new" and "modern" in 1899 did not appear so a decade later. In 1906, Briusov wrote about "growing awareness that 'new' ideas had aged, pushing our most astute and powerful [artists] to explore new paths."[42]

The term *sovremennyi* did not acquire the semantics of sociocultural modernity (*sovremennost´*) until the 1898 launch of the modernist journal *Mir iskusstva*. Unlike *Severnyi vestnik*'s main theorist, Akim Volynskii, who was still using *sovremennyi* in the sense of "contemporary" (as did Merezhkovskii in *On the Reasons for the Decline and on the New Trends in Contemporary Russian Literature*), the *Mir iskusstva* authors took *sovremennyi/sovremennost´* to mean *modern/modernity*.[43] The group's enemy, art critic Vladimir Stasov, duly pointed out the adjective's semantic shift in the modernist idiom.[44] But this usage, too, succumbed to modernism's post-1905 popularity in Russia. Witness the subtitle, "sovremennyi roman," to Anastasiia Verbitskaia's novel, *Kliuchi schast´ia* (Keys to happiness, 1908–13), reviled in the modernist community as a middling potboiler. In 1905, we see signs of terminological discontent in Briusov's compulsion to disambiguate the phrase "modern art" (*sovremennoe iskusstvo*) as "that same art they call 'Symbolist' and 'Decadent,'" and that, in the next sentence, the poet calls "new art," using quotation marks for clarity. By 1907, such elucidating devices were routine.[45] Exploiting this terminological frustration, Andrei Belyi played on the adjective's polysemy. In 1902, he defined "new art" as a product of "our modernity [*sovremennost´*]"; seven years later, he hailed Briusov as an outdated (*nesovremennyi*) writer who defied literary fads as so much modernist plumage (*modernisticheskie per´ia*) but stayed faithful to the spirit of modernity (*sovremennost´*).[46]

By the early 1910s, the epithet *sovremennyi*, like *novyi*, retreated from modernist rhetoric; hence its eventual reclamation by *Sovremennye zapiski* (Contemporary annals, 1920–40)—an émigré journal indifferent to modern-

ism. The adjective's older and newer meanings began to clash, discouraging its use. In Zhirmunskii's *German Romanticism and Modern Mysticism*, the title adjective was already too vague—now it meant "modern," now "contemporary"—in contrast to the term *sovremennost'* (modernity), which retained its modernist resonance in Zhirmunskii's book. A decade later, the same uncertainty weighed over Filipp Vermel's explanation of the difference between "contemporary [*sovremennaia*] literature" and "modern [*sovremennaia*] poetry in the true sense of this word."[47] Unlike the adjective, the noun *sovremennost'* stayed prominent in modernist lexicon. We find it in the Futurist and Acmeist rhetoric of self-legitimation and in the self-descriptions of Soviet and émigré modernists.[48] In the 1920s, Evgenii Zamiatin tried to revive the adjective *sovremennyi* as a marker of modernist art but failed—in part, thanks to the ambiguous epithet's association with fashion-mongering, as codified in Belyi's aforecited formulation, and, in part, because the meaning of *sovremennost'* was then contested by Soviet ideologues intent on imposing their own reading of modernity, wherein modern art had to be loyally Soviet and anti-modernist by default.[49]

The Decadent and Symbolist epithets aged quickly too. Decadence (*upadok*, *dekadentstvo*, *dekadans*) became a Russian household word by the mid-1890s, acting as an umbrella for all deviations from the intelligentsia's artistic and intellectual canon. The negatively marked cognomen linked Russian "new art" to its foreign models and was synonymous with Symbolism—a word less frequently invoked in the 1890s thanks to its greater semantic obscurity.[50] And therein lay an onomastic solution for the advocates of "new art," who exploited the ambiguity of the recently imported terms by interpreting them with contrastive reference to each other.

Zinaida Vengerova exemplified this procedure in her seminal essay, "Symbolist Poets in France" (1892), which presented Symbolism as a positive counterweight to Decadence. Vengerova's essay single-handedly constructed French Symbolism for the Russian reader, who was largely unaware that the critic brought to the common conceptual and onomastic denominator even more French poets than Moréas had invoked during his short-lived Symbolist crusade.[51] Despite Vengerova's advocacy of French Symbolism as a distinct literary school (this Russian critical fiction crumbled in the late 1900s), even professional littérateurs were puzzled by the "unintelligible" notion of Symbolism when Pëtr Pertsov tried to explain it in an 1896 lecture, which was immediately debunked by self-proclaimed Russian Symbolists.[52]

Bowing to the status of Decadence as a negative tag, early modernists

heeded Vengerova's onomastic contrast. They favored Symbolism as a self-appellation in defiance of conventional usage wherein the epithets were interchangeable (even Vladimir Solov'ev treated them as synonyms, his later importance in the modernist pantheon notwithstanding).[53] Aleksandr Blok thus noted, in 1902, that there were "two kinds of literary Decadents, good and bad" and that the first "should not be called Decadents (still a negative notion)," since "the public labeled Decadent anything it did not understand."[54] Modernists also discovered the evaluative potential of contrasting Symbolism to Decadence. They occasionally defined Decadence as the initial anti-positivist revolt, marred by nihilism and hollow aestheticism, and corrected in the Symbolist program. But it was more common for these terms to act in modernist rhetoric as bywords for anything one rejected (Decadence) or accepted (Symbolism) in "new art."[55] In the factious Russian modernist community, opponents were often exiled from the Symbolist heaven to the Decadent purgatory, puzzling outside observers who were not privy to the sectarian logic behind such taxonomy.[56]

A similar semantic trajectory of French terminology informed contemporary Anglophone usage.[57] W. B. Yeats convinced Arthur Symons to modify the title of his survey of French modernism—from *The Decadent Movement in Literature* (as announced in the *Savoy*'s final, December 1896 issue) to *The Symbolist Movement in Literature*—because the first epithet did not do justice to the "great movement of our time." When the book came out, in 1900, its preface contrasted the two terms. Back in 1893, Symons had classified Symbolism as a subspecies of Decadence. Now Decadence became, in his reading, a "mock interlude" of aestheticism and cheap antics, while Symbolism was "a kind of religion" respiritualizing art and life.[58] Symons's book had a lasting impact on Anglo-American critical thought, still visible in Edmund Wilson's use of Symbolism (*Axel's Castle*, 1931) as a generic alternative to modernism.[59] But since no group of Anglophone artists used Symbolism as a self-appellation, the contrastive pair Decadence-Symbolism never sent Anglo-American critics and scholars on the same taxonomical wild-goose chase—the sorting of early modernists into Decadents and Symbolists—that has occupied their Russian counterparts for a century.

With the benefit of hindsight, it is safe to say that Decadence and Symbolism have no meaning but that generated in concrete historical circumstances by the epithets' multifaceted functionality. Like other "isms" that rivaled or came to replace them, Decadence and Symbolism were expedient free-floating signifiers one appropriated or disclaimed in accordance with

the changing needs of literary and cultural politics. Furthermore, a speaker could use the same label in opposite senses to varying ends. It was no accident that Filosofov, writing in 1900, alternately used the appellation Decadence in its negative sense and as Symbolism's synonym. And so did, a year later, another advocate of "new art," Ivanov-Razumnik. Both tried to reclaim Decadence from the foes of "new art," following the French example.[60] The consolidation of Russian modernist culture in the early 1900s, and its resultant push for legitimacy, stimulated such appropriation of Decadence as a term of cheeky self-assertion hitherto restricted to the private sphere. We find this onomastic reclamation in Merezhkovskii's essay "L. Tolstoy and Dostoevsky" (1902); in Belyi's view of "the Decadents" as his generation's vanguard (1903); in the inaugural *Vesy* editorial positioning the journal in "the movement known by such names as 'Decadence,' 'Symbolism,' and 'new art' " (1904); and in Nikolai Berdiaev's description of "the 'Decadents' [as] the only talented poets in today's Russian literature, [and] its most aesthetically refined and cultured wing" (1905)—a terminological choice that marked Berdiaev as a "flashy free-thinker" (Chulkov).[61]

Persisting in the casual usage of some early modernists, such tentative synonymy of Decadence and Symbolism faded away, at least for the purposes of artistic self-fashioning, in the post-1905 crisis of modernist culture that Z. Gippius dubbed "the decadence of Decadence."[62] The mushrooming of the Russian practitioners of suddenly prestigious "new art" gave urgency to factional differentiation disguised as conceptual polemics. "Having multiplied beyond measure, we must devour each other, that is the only way to survive," admitted Briusov in 1907, a year after calling in print for the "abandonment of that word"—Decadence—which had "lost all meaning." In private, he described the crisis of the modernist community as the "death of 'Decadence,' 'Symbolism,' and 'new poetry.' "[63] The neophyte to whom Briusov imparted the bitter news, Georgii Chulkov, blamed the "amorphousness and indeterminacy" of the "hapless term" Decadence on the muddled critical thought of its users. But Chulkov's own clarifications only made matters worse.[64] In this context, some modernist neophytes went on using Decadence and Symbolism as synonyms (Chukovskii), whereas veterans began to treat both labels as "meaningless, bulky nicknames" (Bal'mont) and "boring fictions" (Blok), no doubt because too many newcomers claimed the fashionable labels for themselves, banalizing the terms, which had once sounded like war cries.[65] In 1906, Merezhkovskii rued the terminological chaos reigning in modernist culture: "Such gibberish everywhere, such helter-

skelter, such confusion that no one understands anything anymore. Words have completely lost their original meaning. Every utterance requires a clarification: What do you mean by this? I mean the following. So let us first settle on the terms." Working on the illusory assumption that Decadence and Symbolism had once had fixed and universally shared semantics, Merezhkovskii set out to explicate the true meaning of Decadence as a positive term. But his definition was promptly decried by a fellow modernist, Viacheslav Ivanov, as "sloppy" and unhelpful in view of "the ongoing disintegration of recent groups and literary factions." Ivanov insisted on Symbolism's onomastic superiority to "the popular nickname 'Decadence.'" But his own corrective to Merezhkovskii's clarifications was of no help to all those privy to Ivanov's recent endorsement of the incipient Mystical Anarchists, spearheaded by Chulkov, who, at this time, dismissed both Decadence and Symbolism as outdated terms and concepts.[66]

Such intra-modernist onomastic quarrels were commonplace in 1906–7.[67] Berdiaev endorsed Decadence as a generic and neutral term for all "new art," only to be upbraided by Ellis for "expanding to infinity the notion of Decadence" (Ivanov called Berdiaev's explanation "wretchedly confused"). Ellis voiced the position of the newly regrouped faction in control of the review *Vesy*, which united in a tactical alliance the recent enemies Briusov and Belyi, as crusaders for "true Symbolism."[68] Yet their definition of Symbolism fell on deaf ears.[69] Blok denied the Symbolist title to his former brother-in-arms Belyi (who reciprocated), calling the *Vesy* group "a Decadent kennel." And so did Chulkov, who parried *Vesy*'s attacks on his own Mystical Anarchists by depicting the journal as "a Decadent organ" populated by "epigones of outlived Decadence."[70]

The first crisis of Russian modernist culture, with its mercurial realignments and sectarian polemics, made urgent the issues of terminology and taxonomy as primary instruments in the self-fashioning of veteran and neophyte creators of "new art." Witness the anxious and virulent reaction to a routine critical survey by Evgenii Semënov in the July 1907 issue of a distant French review. A stranger to Russian modernism, Semënov drew the community's outlines by naively relying on the fluid tactical self-definitions of its actors, whom he sorted into pure Decadents, Decadent Parnassians, Romantic neo-Christians (or Symbolists), and Mystical Anarchists.[71] Most authors so profiled denounced the distribution of roles and "isms" in the essay, even if they had once laid claim to them.[72] Polemics with Semënov's taxonomy

and attendant mutual recriminations among modernist grouplets finally created a backlash. An informed insider, Dmitrii Filosofov, broke modernist culture's taboo by dismissing its onomastic and taxonomical jostling as conceptually unimportant. Filosofov articulated what would become the dominant skeptical attitude toward modernist factionalism as a marketing tool. He made light of Russian modernism's onomastic "whirlpool," insisting on the need for a single generic and neutral umbrella term to designate that cultural formation. He then suggested Decadence as the missing term's closest approximation—"an expedient nickname for the whole of ultra-modern literature," even if "'Decadents' take offense when one tries to unite them all with one moniker."[73]

What further deepened the terminological chaos was the belated realization that the "French Symbolist school"—which Russian modernists had treated, since Vengerova's 1892 essay, as their model—was a critical fiction and, worse, a foreign project lending spiritual significance to empty aestheticism, in other words, Decadence disguised as Symbolism.[74] Veterans of Russian modernism thus lost a major critical coordinate even as their privileged position in the community was being contested by neophytes armed with more recent "isms" and manifestos. The leading lights of "new art" defended themselves by dismissing fresh programs and epithets as expressions of artistic vanity, but modernist culture's factional fluidity and endemic infighting devalued all "isms" and agendas, old and new.[75] Besides, growing market hunger for "new art" and the resulting lure of financial remuneration brought under one editorial roof former modernist pariahs and their antagonists turned epigones, exacerbating the terminological and taxonomical disarray. "I simply do not understand anything anymore," commented Belyi in 1907.[76]

By the decade's close—as the epithets "new" and "modern" grew tenuous with regard to a modernist community now accommodating several cohorts of cultural producers, and as the terms Decadence and Symbolism were being invoked every which way against the backdrop of multiplying "isms"—a renewal of critical metalanguage was an urgent necessity. The awareness of a terminological impasse spilled into the larger Russian critical discourse, which had been loath to distinguish between trends and factions in modernist culture. Some critics subsumed modernist practices under umbrella appellations forged from extant terms (L'vov-Rogachevskii: "Symbolists-Decadents"; Gornfel'd: "Decadent or Symbolist milieu—call it as you will"); others resorted to underutilized labels (Pil'skii: "'young' literature").[77] A

1908 catalogue introducing the lay reader to "new art" distinguished, at first, Decadence from Symbolism but then conflated both under a more expedient rubric—modernism.[78] The same penchant for consolidation informed the writings of the Populist and Marxist foes of "new art," who now used modernism, consistently, as a generic name for any recent artifact or artistic practice they disliked.[79] But the friends of "modern" art also yearned to rise above its factional melee.

"It is time to admit," argued Evgenii Anichkov in 1909, "that new literature and art are indivisible entities despite their internal diversity."[80] That year, Liubov' Gurevich lamented the omnipresence of the "tasteless" and "utterly meaningless" term "modernism"—"a new word denoting any literary event palpably marked by something modern."[81] Such grumbling about the changing critical lexicon was now routine. The "ugly word," as "modernism" was qualified in the inaugural issue of the journal *Apollon* (1909), had been embraced as a neutral generic label even by the die-hard torchbearers of the belabored notion of Symbolism.

In 1909, one such firebrand, Ellis, began to use Decadence, Symbolism, and modernism ("an elastic and hackneyed term") as synonyms, but with a preference manifest in his book's title, *Russian Symbolists* (1910).[82] Similar agnosticism marked the farewell editorial of *Vesy* (1909), which described the journal's legacy as "going by the names of 'Symbolism,' 'modernism,' 'new art,' and even 'Decadence.'"[83] By 1913, the term modernism appeared in the Brockhaus *New Encyclopedic Dictionary*, where Vengerova called Briusov "a founder of Russian modernism."[84] A year later, she placed that label on the British Pre-Raphaelites and Aesthetes, on the French poets she had once called Decadents and Symbolists, and on the pioneers of Russian modernism from the *Severnyi vestnik* circle.[85] Vengerova also hinted at the reasons for her onomastic change of heart: "Strangely enough, Symbolism, despite its two-decade dominance, has not yet received a precise definition."[86] Her wariness of the Symbolist moniker was shared by all those privy to the inconclusive polemic that had pitted, in 1906–12, self-styled Russian Symbolists against each other in futile attempts to define its meaning.[87] Symbolism's stubborn conceptual ambiguity curtailed its utility as a critical term. In 1916, Briusov explained his current usage as follows: "[Those] who saw themselves as creators of 'new poetry' and 'new art' [. . .] used to be called 'Decadents' and 'Symbolists' because, back then, the word 'modernism' was not yet in circulation."[88]

The Russian Domestication of the Term "Modernism"

How did modernism get there? For all the ambiguity and axiological range of the Decadent and Symbolist labels, it was modernism that initially elicited the most suspicion and scorn in Russia. It first appeared in the lexicon of *Mir iskusstva* critics, who invoked modernism, alternately, as a neutral umbrella name for all "new styles" in visual arts, starting with Impressionism, and as a designator of their marketplace popularity, which turned genuine art into fashion-mongering.[89] In 1904, Belyi invoked literary modernism in the latter, negative sense, as a foil to "true Symbolism."[90] Modernism was the least common among the onomastic options for denoting "new art" in turn-of-the-century Russia. It shared an aura of undomesticated foreignness with the cognate substantives—*modérn*, *modérna*, *modérnchik*, *stil'-modérn*—whose oft-dismissive use as markers of artistic vanity persisted into the 1920s.[91] Nonetheless, in a testimony to its terminological visibility, modernism flanked Decadence in Viktor Burenin's 1905 parodies of "new art," run by the popular newspaper *Novoe vremia*.[92] The subsequent spike in the word's frequency and its semantic evolution owed much to growing terminological and taxonomical chaos in the Russian modernist community.

In the post-1905 polemics run by the *Vesy* faction on behalf of "true Symbolism," modernism retained the connotations of a hollow artistic fad. The group's opponents returned the favor, mocking *Vesy* as a "modernist magazine."[93] But, like Decadence before it, the term benefited from the ongoing search for a unifying name that could do justice to Russian "new art." The terminological lacuna set the stage for modernism's rehabilitation as a form of proud self-designation and a neutral umbrella epithet.[94] The process of onomastic domestication was manifest already in 1907, when Briusov, despite his *Vesy* affiliation, began to deploy modernism as a synonym of extant generic labels for Russia's cultural ferment, placing the word in quotes to stress the novelty of his usage. In a concurrent riposte to Briusov's journal—which usurped the Symbolist brand, reviling opponents as Decadents—Viacheslav Ivanov dismissed the latter moniker as a "provincialism" and advanced modernism as the best unifying tag for Russia's "new intellectual and aesthetic movement," its internecine squabbles aside.[95] By 1908, the term "modernism" broke through the dam of suspicion and squeamishness across the Russian field of cultural production, losing quotation marks and overshadowing more familiar words. The main quarrel about the newly popular

label concerned its applicability to specific artists, with outsiders to modernist culture being more liberal in taxonomical matters.[96]

Amid polemical paroxysms, even Belyi started invoking modernism with nuance. In 1907, he castigated "modernist hooligans," while waxing nostalgic about the days when he and "a few genuine innovators had withstood furious derision as modernism was being mocked all over Russia." Soon, such slips grew frequent enough among the *Vesy* sectarians, wary of a unified vision of "new art," to require a terminological review.[97] Belyi undertook this project in 1908, positing the impossibility of a common denominator for all the practices presently dubbed modernist. In his view, there was merit to distinguishing modernism from Symbolism, since the latter had a narrower, and thus clearer, meaning.[98] Clarity, of course, was in the eye of the beholder. Amid the modernist community's fluid alliances and factional bickering, outside observers could not find an artistic milieu stable enough to be labeled Symbolist for any length of time.[99]

Consider the intra-modernist onomastic tiffs sparked, in 1910, by Viacheslav Ivanov's and Aleksandr Blok's attempts to define Symbolism and, in 1912, by the first issue of the journal *Trudy i dni*, where Belyi's reconstituted faction, including his recent foes Blok and Ivanov, "affirmed the principles of true Symbolism [. . .] independent from so-called 'modernism.' "[100] All these definitions of Symbolism proved so broad that they did to the signifier and its signified what Ivanov himself had once decried in Merezhkovskii's "sloppy" theory of Decadence. Other modernists demurred. "I cannot abide imprecise usage," railed Kuzmin. "I completely disagree with the application of 'Symbolism' to whatever one likes," inveighed Briusov. Both insisted that Symbolism referred to a pan-European movement ending in the mid-1900s, so that "new art" created since then had to go by another name. This was confirmed by the quick unraveling of *Trudy i dni*, whose contributors privately questioned the journal's advocacy of "a nonexistent school," as Blok put it in his diary, further calling "the 'Symbolist school'—murky water."[101] By this time, the Symbolist moniker was just a differentiating marker devoid of content. In 1913, contrasting his modernist cohort to its younger rivals, Belyi told Blok that there was a difference between "us, the Symbolists," and those other chasers of "little tags" (i.e., Acmeists and Futurists). Yet he never explained what he meant by Symbolism. "Each of us understands 'Symbolism' differently—so the word does not really matter," he assured Blok.[102]

Given the terminological and taxonomical confusion in Russian modernist culture, its outside observers migrated to modernism as a lesser onomas-

tic evil and a disambiguating label for all dissenters from the intelligentsia's aesthetic and philosophical orthodoxy.[103] In 1909, this usage got a seal of academic approval when an authoritative literary scholar, Semën Vengerov, sketched a Russian modernist history consisting of "two distinct moments." The first—from the late 1880s through the 1890s—belonged to "older modernists" (*modernisty starshie*); the second, still ongoing, was ruled by "latter-day modernists" (*modernisty pozdneishie*).[104] This usage subsequently informed *Twentieth Century Russian Literature* (1914–16), a collective project Vengerov directed. The scholar repeated here the merits of "modernism" as a signifier for the cultural episode "encompassing a large number of phenomena from the past quarter century onward"—a term second in utility only to the underused "neoromanticism," which Vengerov actually preferred.[105]

In the year of Vengerov's stock-taking essay, Innokentii Annenskii—equally eager to rise above the factional fray of "new art," in whose creation he partook as a poet—gave his vote of confidence to the modernist moniker as a device of critical taxonomy and a conceptual tool of art history. Annenskii's survey of "modern" Russian poetry was programmatic, not least because it ran in *Apollon*, whose first issues coincided with the demise of the major modernist magazines *Vesy* and *Zolotoe runo*, marking a new phase in Russian modernist culture. Among *Apollon*'s declared goals was the reunification of the modernist community, whose "bugaboos, made in France and Nizhnii Novgorod—Symbolism, neorealism, clarism, etc., bored stiff the public and us, writers," in the words of the journal's editor.[106]

Annenskii opened his essay by doubting the adequacy of the Symbolist and Decadent labels and problematizing them in the context of their "polemical" and "ambiguous" French history. The next article in the series introduced a terminological alternative—"modernism"—applicable to all "new" poets, from the 1890s on, their aesthetic and philosophical heterogeneity notwithstanding. Annenskii's striving for an integrative vision was no doubt motivated by his uncertain position in the factional patchwork of Russian "new art." Witness the "violent protests" the poet's conceptual approach elicited in modernist circles, whose sectarian sensibilities were ruffled by the essay's "disregard for the shades of school distinctions" (Makovskii).[107] Be that as it may, Annenskii and Vengerov set an example for all those seeking to counter the fragmentation of "modern" art in a synthesizing vision of its past and present.[108]

The last installment of Annenskii's essay charted the timeline of Russia's "lyrical modernism" as a fifteen-year history punctuated by artistic cohorts.[109]

The poet's death left the schema incomplete, but his usage passed to younger *Apollon* critics, who invoked modernism consistently, albeit with the usual hand-wringing about "the vague and ugly word we must use for clarity's sake."[110] Nikolai Gumilev invoked modernism as a neutral umbrella term designating the past decades of "new art" and its current life.[111] Pursuing his agenda of artistic self-legitimation, the poet elaborated a tripartite modernist history: "The first generation of Russian modernists" arose in the 1890s; "the second stage of Russian modernism" debuted in the early 1900s; and "the third generation," his own, matured during the post-1905 crisis.[112]

Characteristically, Gumilev fancied the modernist moniker only as long as he hoped to amalgamate and spearhead the "third generation" in a structure of his own making, the Poets' Guild—a "parliament of sorts representing all poetic parties."[113] Once this unity project failed, Gumilev reverted ("two years too late," in Briusov's estimate) to the stock modernist device of inventing an "ism." Incidentally, the first public mentions of Acmeism, in late 1912 (the printed manifestos appeared in 1913), coincided with the irruption on the literary stage of its Cubo-Futurist rival with the almanac *A Slap in the Face of Public Taste*, whose contributors Gumilev had tried and failed to enlist to his cause.[114]

New Names, Old Problems

Gumilev's Acmeist brand hit a wall of skepticism. At the time of intense competition for public attention accompanying the coming of age of the post-1905 modernist cohort, most objections targeted not the gist of Gumilev's program but the need to set its exponents apart from other modernist poets. Acmeists were treated as speculators whose "ism" and manifestos were publicity stunts targeting the cultural market.[115] The Acmeist episode was brief. Anna Akhmatova, its central actor, located Acmeism's "debacle" in late 1913, singling out the failure of the term itself.[116] But Gumilev's project did last in one sense—as a proverbial example of the ephemerality of modernist artistic schools.[117]

The poets Gumilev called Acmeists were so disparate that their association looked opportunistic. The coterie's nominal members were at odds about each other's appurtenance to the program laid out in Gumilev's and Sergei Gorodetskii's manifestos.[118] Besides, half of the self-identified Acmeists—Osip Mandel'shtam, Vladimir Narbut, and Mikhail Zenkevich—gravitated toward rival Futurist grouplets. Mandel'shtam's aesthetic affinities with Velimir Khlebnikov and Boris Pasternak and their shared interest in Formalist theo-

ries only grew with time; hence Mandel'shtam's use of the Cubo-Futurist slogan—"the word as such" (*slovo kak takovoe*)—in his own theory of Acmeism, which the poet understood as a more competent version of Futurism.[119] Contemporary critics cited many overlaps between the Acmeist and diverse Futurist agendas, chalking up "the feud of the twins" (Red'ko) to factional squabbling.[120] Last but not least, as self-styled reformers of Symbolism—a term each of them filled with idiosyncratic meaning—the Acmeists failed to convince their public of the discontinuity between them and their precursors. It did not help, of course, that Gumilev and Gorodetskii, known epigones of early modernist poetry, whose Symbolist banner they had carried high in the late 1900s, quarreled about Symbolism's place in the Acmeist aesthetic.[121] As a result, the view of Acmeism as a vainglorious critical fiction framed and outlasted the putative school's life.[122]

Onomastic considerations figured prominently in Gumilev's tentative movement, whose members never quite agreed what to call themselves, torn as they were between Acmeism and its synonym, Adamism (from the biblical Adam as the original namer of all things).[123] Hostile reception exacerbated the issue. In 1912, denying the poetic distinctiveness of Gumilev's coterie, Blok pooh-poohed their "isms" and dubbed them modernists. Two years later, he described the entire post-1905 poetic cohort as "poisoned with modernism."[124] Incidentally, Gumilev's Futurist peers were also unable to settle on a name. Cubo- and Ego-Futurists were only two of the four better-known groups claiming to represent true Futurism. A veteran of the Futurist milieu, Benedikt Livshits, retrospectively likened its heterogeneity to that of Acmeism, pointing to the irrelevance of shared aesthetics in the emergence of artistic factions as a peculiarity of his modernist cohort, whose alliances had been more tactical than conceptual.[125] The self-styled Futurists brandished the modernist moniker as an invective that, by the mid-1910s, supplanted Decadence in its role as a term of intra-modernist abuse.[126] Such usage did nothing to alleviate the terminological and taxonomical confusion reigning in modernist culture.

Many of those labeled Futurists—Khlebnikov, Livshits, Vladimir Maiakovskii, and even David Burliuk, who allegedly renamed the group initially called Hylaea the Cubo-Futurists—treated the term as an imposition grudgingly accepted for lack of a better word (like Decadence, which had been slapped on modernists, who then coopted it). Futurism said little about commonalities in the divergent aesthetics of authors so dubbed and suggested their kinship to the eponymous Italian group, which they denied. The term's

Russification—*budetliane*, *budushchniki*—hardly solved the problem, since Russian Futurists paid more heed to the archaic and the primitive than to technological modernity.[127] Like the Acmeists, and despite their claims to the contrary, the Futurists inherited from early modernism its topics (urbanism, machine civilization, modernity's chaos), practices (experimental syntax, phonetics, prosody, and lexicon), sensibility, and artistic philosophy.[128] Like the Acmeists, the Futurists of all shades could not agree on the proper attitude toward the authors they called Symbolists and who had been their teachers, as in the cases of Ivanov and Khlebnikov; Belyi and Pasternak; Briusov, Bal'mont, and Severianin; Belyi, Briusov, and Maiakovskii.[129] Such intergenerational affinities exposed the younger poets to ridicule as epigones, deflating their claims to a distinct place in the field of cultural production. The fact that critics denying Futurist claims to originality also upheld the integrative view of "new art," and thus favored modernism over factional labels, may explain that term's negative resonance in the Futurist rhetoric.[130]

In Russia, terminological reservations about Futurism surfaced as early as 1910, when Kuzmin cast F. T. Marinetti's group as marketing con artists.[131] Such awareness of the contrived nature of "isms" distinguished Russian modernist culture in the 1910s from its previous iterations. If it took early modernists almost two decades to realize that imported terms meant different things at home and abroad—French Symbolism was a painful case in point—the post-1905 cohort quickly distanced itself from the putative Italian model, which Russian Futurists, in their own words, "resembled in name only."[132] The continuous sprouting of "isms" abroad gave Russians every reason to attribute such onomastic activity to venal calculation. When, in 1914, D. H. Lawrence called Ezra Pound's Imagism "just an advertising scheme," his verdict unwittingly echoed lessons learned from the Acmeist "debacle." Imagism's ephemeral life recalled that of Acmeism, and it promptly turned out to be Pound's vanity project. When epigones began to replicate the semantic obscurity and free verse of the Imagists, threatening Pound's control over the brand, he invented Vorticism, whose sole rationale, as contemporaries saw it, was to distinguish Pound and his allies in the cultural market: there was no more substance to support Imagist and Vorticist claims to unique and coherent poetics than in the cases of Russian Acmeism and numerous Futurisms.[133]

Spurning Anglo-American "isms," some Russians found in Futurism a solution to terminological quandaries, perhaps because Futurism, like modernism, echoed the temporal focus of the notion of modernity. In 1914, Genrikh

Tasteven extended the Futurist appellation to all current modernist practices, presenting Futurism as perfected or "new Symbolism" (cf. Mandel'shtam's idea of Acmeism as a corrective to "pseudo-Symbolism").[134] Unlike Acmeism, whose short factional life undercut its chances at broad terminological adoption, Futurism became a generic rival to the modernist moniker. Witness Zinaida Vengerova's 1915 interview with Ezra Pound, which applied the Futurist label to the Vorticist-Imagist milieu, over Pound's objections, and to the circle of Guillaume Apollinaire—a procedure later replicated by Marinetti, whose Paris manifesto (1924) gathered under the Futurist tag all European modernists.[135] Using Futurism as an umbrella term, Vengerova justified her classification by bringing the English and French poets she called Futurists to the common denominator of "the modernism-tinted sensibility."[136]

The use of Futurism as a generic marker got a boost during the war, which became a consolidating factor in Russian modernist culture.[137] Consider the almanac *Strelets* (1915), which published Vengerova's interview with Pound and united modernist rivals of all ages and factions in a patriotic fundraising cause. Like previous tactical alliances, this one did not last, but the taboo had been broken once more, exposing the exaggeration of artistic discontinuities in the fractious modernist milieu.[138] Soon it became possible to say that Mandel'shtam had beaten the Futurists at their own game (Lunts), that Akhmatova was "no less of an artistic revolutionary than Maiakovskii" (Eikhenbaum), and that Belyi was "the only notable Futurist in prose" (Berdiaev) and a teacher to the Futurists (Pasternak)—a view Belyi himself upheld by advocating Khlebnikov's "transrational" poetry.[139] By 1919, painter Ivan Puni rued Futurism's Russian mutation into a byword for all "modern" art, beginning with Cézanne.[140] Hence the warning issued by Samuil Vermel', who had been a Futurist publisher in 1915–16, in response to Vladimir Markov's latter-day research query: "First, explain which Russian poets you mean when you speak about the Futurist group. They used to hang that 'Futurist' label on all young poets."[141]

The terminological situation of the 1910s, then, showed little improvement over the chaotic 1900s. And the plot thickened still more with the rise of Formalism, so dubbed through the tried and true modernist appropriation of a negative epithet imposed from the outside.[142] The Formalist scholars-cum-littérateurs were engaged in the partisan battles of "new art," which Boris Eikhenbaum later recalled as "the chaos of 'isms'" and Viktor Zhirmunskii regretted as the source of an optical illusion forcing "a witness to an unfolding literary process to focus on differences at the expense of sim-

ilarities."[143] With no consensual critical terminology in sight, the Formalists lacked the metalanguage to describe modernist art, while striving to position themselves as its authoritative explicators and promoters. Consider the onomastic vicissitudes of Zhirmunskii's crusade for Acmeism.

If most Formalists rallied to (Cubo-)Futurism, Zhirmunskii resented its nonrepresentational aesthetic and scolded his colleagues for embracing a poetics devoid of the philosophical, religious, and existential depth of romanticism, Symbolism, and Acmeism, as he understood them.[144] In 1916, he undertook to rehabilitate Acmeism as a counterweight to Futurism. Adding one more stage to Gumilev's aforecited tripartite vision of modernist history, better to account for his own cohort, Zhirmunskii replaced Gumilev's term "modernism" with Symbolism. But making the latter notion the conceptual cornerstone of "new art" brought nothing but trouble. Kuzmin thus incongruously became, in Zhirmunskii's nomenclature, the leader of the third Symbolist wave. Gorodetskii and Gumilev, who had entered literary life concurrently with Kuzmin but, unlike him, had indeed self-identified as Symbolists, ended up in the fourth cohort among "those who overcame Symbolism"—a phrase Zhirmunskii tacitly borrowed from *Vesy* polemics against "modernist hooligans" hell-bent on "overcoming Symbolism."[145] Ellis wrote these words in 1909. But Gumilev and Gorodetskii did not give up on Symbolism until 1912. Anachronistically rewriting past factional squabbles to influence the modernist community's present artistic life, Zhirmunskii unwittingly painted himself into a corner.

When Zhirmunskii made public his ideas, in the essay "Those Who Overcame Symbolism," Acmeism was a notoriously failed project, even if its former standard-bearers hailed Zhirmunskii's argument as a belated vindication.[146] Making his case for the existence of a shared aesthetic and philosophical core in the poetry of Akhmatova, Gumilev, and Mandel'shtam, Zhirmunskii bemoaned Acmeism as an "unfortunate," "hazy," "empty," and "mannerish" term.[147] Instead, he favored the phrase "the poets of *Giperborei*," in reference to the almanac of Gumilev's Poets' Guild (1912–13). However, *Giperborei*'s agenda ("furthering the gains of the epoch called Decadent or modernist") differed from that of Acmeism, just as the interests of Gumilev's coterie departed from those of the larger guild.[148] Defying historical facts, Zhirmunskii constructed a broad "new poetic movement" centered on Gumilev's inner circle. But as he endeavored to reformulate Acmeism's botched program, Zhirmunskii was at a loss for terms distinguishing the agenda of Gumilev's school from other modernist practices. Symbolism was

chronologically unfitting. Besides, Zhirmunskii saw the flaws of the "Symbolist appellation," which he deemed "applicable in the most proper and true sense" only to Belyi, Blok, and Ivanov.[149] Futurism, now a generic label for all modernist poetry, was not an option for Zhirmunskii as a partisan critic. Witness the absence of Futurists among "those who overcame Symbolism." It would appear, then, that the bulky phrase—*preodolevshie simvolizm*—functioned as an effective admission of a terminological impasse.

Why did Zhirmunskii not affix the modernist tag on Gumilev's "new poetic movement"? For those immersed in modernism's factional battles, the label resonated with the derisive sense it had in Futurist rhetoric. Consequently, it was more neutral as a historical term than as a name for current artistic events—recall Vengerova's choice of modernism for the Brockhaus *Dictionary*, in contrast to Futurism in her Pound interview. Eikhenbaum's rejoinder to Zhirmunskii bore out this logic. Casting Acmeism as "the final word of [Russian] modernism," Eikhenbaum presented the history of the latter as a succession of three poetic generations—from early Symbolists to Acmeists. He placed Futurism outside this history, as a chronologically posterior and qualitatively novel event, letting Futurists bask in the synonymy of youth and novelty, although Akhmatova (b. 1889), Gumilev (b. 1886), and Mandel'shtam (b. 1891) belonged to one generation with Khlebnikov (b. 1885) and Maiakovskii (b. 1893).[150] In a different context, Eikhenbaum wrote about Akhmatova and Maiakovskii as kindred artistic revolutionaries.[151] But in this instance, Zhirmunskii's critique of the Formalist fancy for (Cubo-) Futurist poetics antagonized Eikhenbaum so much that he polemically appropriated his opponent's catchphrase, summing up his riposte: "Truly, the Futurists are the ones overcoming Symbolism."[152]

In the late 1910s and early 1920s, when this exchange unfolded, modernist critics thus had a new tool at their disposal. To dismiss a literary practice, one assimilated it to early modernism. Eikhenbaum fused Acmeism and Symbolism under the rubric of modernism. Zhirmunskii, in another statement, did likewise to Futurism and Symbolism, bringing them to the common denominator of romanticism, contrary to Acmeism, which, in his view, had revolutionized Russian poetry by reviving its dormant classical tradition. Mandel'shtam turned Zhirmunskii's thesis into a slogan, "Classical poetry is the poetry of the revolution," whereas Eikhenbaum found it paradoxical and far fetched.[153]

Going into its fourth decade, Russian modernist culture was as far as ever from a consensual critical metalanguage. Modernism and Futurism were

now the most common umbrella terms, and their varied and often contrastive uses recalled those of the Decadent-Symbolist pair. Widespread use of Futurism as a byword for modernist art created a backlash. In 1922, Mandel'shtam railed against "the notion of so-called Futurism, invented by ignorant critics and devoid of any content."[154] Even Futurism's promoters found themselves in a bind. In 1921, Roman Jakobson tried to outline the meaning of Futurism, "without defining the term precisely," through the analysis of select poetic practices. Yet his reading of Khlebnikov's oeuvre shed no light on "Futurism as a new movement in European art" that had supplanted modernism, in Jakobson's words. Similarly, Tynianov's 1928 essay invoked Khlebnikov's Futurist classification only to dismiss it later as a "terminological convention applied to diverse phenomena" and "akin to a surname borne by different relatives and even namesakes."[155]

Politics and Cultural Toponymy

After the Bolshevik coup, modernists rallying to Lenin's rule tried on various politically correct "isms"—Revolutionary Futurists, Proletarian Artists, Communist Futurists (*komfuty*)—which Marxist critics uniformly dismissed.[156] This onomastic readjustment included the tentative semantic tightening of Futurism in the phrase "left-wing art" (*levoe iskusstvo*).[157] This usage, likely pioneered by Briusov in 1913 with reference to Ego-Futurism, proved as "sloppy" (Livshits) as the Futurist label.[158] A term linking art to ideology could not win a large following, all the more so because, as a tool of literary history, the Left-Right divide was useless.[159] However, the disambiguating phrase did stick in the lexicon of Russian modernism's Soviet loyalists. Consider Sergei Tret'iakov's critique of Futurism as a word embracing too much, and thus meaning little, in the inaugural issue of *LEF*—the organ of the Left Front of Art, which united many self-identified Futurists and Formalists.[160]

Another inconclusive attempt to solve Futurism's semantic inflation came as a by-product of mass expatriation from Soviet Russia, which revived contacts with the West, after years of war, netting a new term—the "avant-garde" (*avangard*). This French epithet had not hitherto figured in Russian modernist usage among such synonyms as *peredovoi* (frontline), *razvedchiki* (scouts), *predtechi* (forerunners), and *pretoriantsy* (the Praetorian Guard).[161] The term's Russian biography echoed its semantic evolution in France. In the 1820s, Saint-Simon had adapted *l'avant-garde* from military usage to designate radical politics and art as its vehicle. The term acquired its familiar meaning of artistic innovation only in the 1870s, coming to signify the mar-

riage of political and aesthetic iconoclasm. French modernists availed themselves of this qualifier whenever they cast their art as a form of revolutionary politics.[162] In Russia, the avant-garde's early invocations, referencing aesthetic innovation, drowned in Marxist discourse, which used this word to describe the proletariat's political mission.[163] The fusion of radical politics and aesthetics in the term's Russian semantics occurred only in the 1920s. Consider Il'ia Erenburg's and El' Lisitskii's Berlin journal *Veshch'* (1922), whose politics were openly pro-Soviet. Erenburg, donning the identity of an invented French poet (Jean Salot), didactically explained to the journal's Russian readers that, in France, "modern" art was called avant-gardist rather than left-wing—"ne levoe (gauche), no avant-gardnoe (avant-garde)."[164] He then went on to apply the critical neologism to all "new art" he endorsed, from the fin de siècle onward, using modernism as its antonym.[165]

As in the case of left-wing art, the pro-Soviet bias inherent in the avant-garde concept stalled its widespread terminological adoption. Witness Kuzmin's squeamish choice of older terms in his eulogy of Briusov, whom he defiantly called a modernist and "a literary pioneer always on modernity's frontlines," despite Briusov's post-1917 Communist Party membership.[166] On the other side of the geopolitical divide, émigré modernists attached the avant-garde label to authors implicated in pro-Soviet politics and who, by this token, could not be on modernity's cutting edge—a prized position émigrés denoted by other terms, especially since the avant-garde moniker was increasingly seen in Western modernist circles as old hat.[167] On those occasions when they did invoke the avant-garde as a positive marker of émigré art, exiled modernists did so to wrest from Soviet loyalists the claim to Russian cultural leadership.[168] This appropriation polemicized with Soviet criticism, which called aesthetically traditional art avant-gardist insofar as it promoted the political cause of "the vanguard of humanity"—the party-led proletariat.[169]

The terminological uncertainty reigning in Russian modernist culture was aggravated by its second, post-1917 crisis, which manifested itself in the revival of factionalism. As in the late 1900s, skepticism toward nascent "isms" grew apace with their mushrooming. "A poetic passport, a place in a school can no longer aid poets," concluded Tynianov in 1924.[170] By then, the fragmentation of modernist culture had reached a tipping point. The names and manifestos of ephemeral grouplets—Constructivism, Expressionism, Imaginism, Scythianism, to name but a few—seemed to have no bearing on the disparate practices of their acolytes.[171] Acmeism's critical abuse paled

in comparison to the derision presently reserved for the budding modernist factions, accused of vainglorious marketplace speculation.[172]

In this atmosphere of suspicion, many critics fell back on older terms, no matter how dubious they may have originally appeared. Hence the application of Futurism to all poetic practices even remotely reminiscent of Futurist currents circa 1913. Acmeism also got a second lease on life, aided by Zhirmunskii's effort to rehabilitate Gumilev's project and by the concurrent rise of Akhmatova and Mandel'shtam to positions of artistic authority. Briusov was one such former sceptic recycling Acmeism as an opportune onomastic umbrella for all those newly coined "isms" that did not fit under the elastic rubric of Futurism.[173] A tenuous and oft-criticized remedy to the chronic lack of adequate terminology, this practice of sorting the Russian modernist poetry of the 1920s into (neo-)Futurist and (neo-)Acmeist—and even "Futuro-Acmeist" and "Lefo-akmeist"—persisted throughout the decade.[174]

Critics also struggled to account for modernism's historical continuity. Many artists active at the century's turn were still writing in the 1920s, defying the Futurist-Acmeist taxonomy.[175] Some critics sought a solution to the problem in disambiguating formulations, like "new age Symbolism" and "contemporary Symbolism."[176] But any such recourse to older epithets in the midst of current terminological uncertainty only gave urgency to the onomastic and taxonomical dilemmas of the past. Thus, school divisions that had formerly seemed conceptually important presently appeared all the more irrelevant. Ivanov-Razumnik, once a partisan modernist critic, now grouped Blok, Sologub, Khlebnikov, Belyi, and Gumilev in a single tradition he dubbed "modern literature" (*sovremennaia literatura*). Another ex-sectarian of modernism, Mandel'shtam, used the same ambiguous and outmoded epithet, *sovremennyi*, to extend Ivanov-Razumnik's list to Viacheslav Ivanov, Akhmatova, Maiakovskii, Kuzmin, and Pasternak as members of a single "family" of "modern Russian poetry."[177]

In the 1920s, we can observe a palpable generational split in terminological matters, whereby those littérateurs who had matured intellectually before the second crisis of Russian modernist culture continued to treat modernism as a viable onomastic option, unlike the budding literary cohort. Despite the modernist label's "ambiguity and faint condescension" (Mandel'shtam), older authors consistently applied it as a neutral designator for all "new art" in the 1890s–1900s (Jakobson, Kuzmin, Pertsov, Prishvin, Veresaev), or in the 1890s–1910s (Chukovskii, Piast, Red'ko, Reisner), by it-

self or interchangeably with Symbolism (Belyi, Ivanov-Razumnik, Maksimov, L'vov-Rogachevskii) and Decadence (Medvedev).[178] Some also invoked modernism as a negative marker of reliance on outlived practices (Aseev, Gorodetskii, Lezhnev).[179] In contrast, the up-and-coming literary cohort was uneasy about the modernist tag, both as a signifier for current artistic practices and as a historical term. In the latter quality, they replaced it with Symbolism. As a young critic opined, "Today, 'modernism' sounds bizarre with reference to a school that has left the stage and is no longer related to modernity [*sovremennost'*], to the 'modern,' the way Symbolism was in the early twentieth century."[180] This vision of the first two decades of modernist culture as its Symbolist phase—despite being criticized by veteran modernists as "incongruous" (Khovin) in its elision of the period's diversity and the term's ambiguity—went mainstream in the encyclopedic dictionaries, manuals, and anthologies published in Soviet Russia in the mid-1920s.[181]

The surge in books devoted, partly or in full, to modernist terminology and taxonomy was explicitly motivated by the desire to educate Soviet readers.[182] The unspoken rationale of these pedagogical tools resided in the Marxist state's concurrent push for monopoly over the interpretation of cultural expression, which required a uniform metalanguage. Appearing in 1925–26, these didactic texts searched for a relatively neutral critical lexicon. But the politicization of Soviet cultural life soon changed the course of the terminological quest. As already mentioned, Russian Marxists had used the modernist label since the mid-1900s as a blanket term for "new art," the better to dismiss all of it as bourgeois. Presently, they expressed their scorn for modernist culture by dismissing its "isms" from the position of political authority. Consider the discursive strategy of an aesthetically liberal Marxist critic, Viacheslav Polonskii, as he surveyed the quarter century of literary life before Lenin's coup: "Decadents, Symbolists, Mystics, God-seekers, Mystical Anarchists, Naturalists, Realists, Acmeists, Clarists, Romantics, Futurists, Impressionists, Aesthetes—and so on,—all these schools arose within the *bourgeois* literary movement, their squabbles mirroring the bourgeois society's struggles."[183] Polonskii italicized *bourgeois*, like the critics who had italicized *sovremennyi* and *novyi* some thirty years earlier to emphasize their special meaning as designators of modernist practices. In the lexicon of Soviet Marxists, the qualifier "bourgeois" indeed became, in the 1920s, a stand-in for the elusive generic marker of "modern" art, a literary "ism," along with its proletarian antonym.[184] But since the "bourgeois" qualifier was not neutral, it could not resolve the terminological uncertainty dogging

Polonskii's efforts to describe modernist artifacts he actually liked. Witness the tortuous list of epithets the critic conjured up to speak about Iurii Olesha's novel, *Envy*: "fusing Realism, nay Naturalism, with Impressionism"; "frontline art"; "extremely modern"; "conflating Realism and Symbolism"; "experimental prose"; "close to Expressionism." In the same year, 1929, an aesthetically conservative Marxist experienced no such difficulty, labeling all current modernist prose, from Olesha and Kaverin to Mandel'shtam and Vaginov, right-wing and bourgeois.[185] In this taxonomy, a shrinking no man's land was reserved for fellow travelers, the term designating writers who lived and published in Soviet Russia but did not qualify for the status of proletarian/revolutionary artists, mostly because both categories were subject to constant polemics, much like the terms and concepts of Decadence, Symbolism, and Futurism before them.[186]

With the outbreak of the Stalinist Cultural Revolution in 1928, mounting ideological pressure rendered immaterial the critical quest for the metalanguage describing modernism, now stigmatized in its historical totality and aesthetic heterogeneity.[187] The consolidation of state control in the Soviet field of cultural production—culminating in its 1932 structural reform and the concurrent designation of officially endorsed aesthetics, past (Critical Realism) and present (Socialist Realism)—streamlined onomastic matters in the USSR. The qualifiers "left-wing," "proletarian," and "fellow traveler" faded away to be subsumed by the unifying Soviet label, which implied art's loyalty to the state. Stalinism put to the sword forty years of terminological brooding along with its culprit, modernist culture. From 1932 on, the timeworn terms "decadence" (*upadok*, *dekadentstvo*) and "degeneracy" (*vyrozhdenie*), as well as the newly appropriated formalism—written here in the lower case because referring to no particular group or milieu—designated the opposite of the state-approved aesthetic. Outfitted with the qualifier "bourgeois," they denoted Socialist Realism's foil, encompassing the full chronological and typological range of Russian and transnational modernism.[188] At the time of its creation, this terminological principle was hailed for cutting the Gordian knot of "rattling manifestos and squabbling 'isms'" in bourgeois formalist art that was now superseded by another, "socialist art, accessible to millions in its rich, bright, simple, and manly form."[189]

The term "modernism" retreated from Soviet critical lexicon in the 1930s–40s, probably because it could not match the propagandistic potential and polemical thrust of such terms as "bourgeois decadence" and "formalism." We find the rare invocations of "modernism," as a synonym of the more

common invectives, in occasional critical texts.[190] But it is hardly an accident that, in the 1937 volume of the scholarly series *Literaturnoe nasledstvo*, devoted to early modernism, Symbolism acted as a blanket term for "new art" and a neutral alternative to Stalinist epithets, whereas "modernism" was used once in the entire sprawling tome.[191] As its public life in Soviet Russia subsided, the term "modernism" migrated to the private sphere of diaries, unpublished monographs, and intimate conversations. Veterans of "new art" invoked modernism, in a vaguely antiestablishment gesture, as a neutral all-encompassing tag for the culture's history in Russia before the Bolshevik coup.[192]

Among Russian émigrés, terminological reflection followed a dynamic of its own. Exiles dismissed modernist "isms" and manifestos—new and old—as puerile histrionics rendered irrelevant by the recent sociopolitical cataclysms, which they saw as the temporal limit of an aborted cultural era that needed integrative conceptual rethinking.[193] In this context, the modernist tag found as much favor in the critical discourse of Russia Abroad as it had, back in Russia, in the wake of the 1905 revolution, when a similar sense of historical closure had propelled modernism to terminological prominence. To be sure, the word's applications to *current* art were rare among émigré critics.[194] The opposite was true for modernism as a marker of cultural ferment in the Russian Empire's final quarter century.[195] For Artur Lur'e, writing in 1926, this onomastic choice designated "what we, in the past ten to fifteen years, have been habitually calling 'modernism.'"[196] In contrast, Fëdor Stepun treated the same term as a generic signifier of all "new art," from Bal'mont to Maiakovskii. "I am consciously choosing this word," he wrote in 1935, "as the most neutral and inclusive."[197] And so did Dmitrii Mirskii, in 1924, casting "Symbolism as a major expression of a wider and more significant movement whose totality can be designated, alas, only by the unpleasant word 'modernism,'" which he then pitched to English readers as "inadequate and exceedingly repulsive, but [. . .] the only one to cover the whole ground of the new movement" in twentieth-century Russia.[198]

In 1925, Mirskii's political nemesis, Vladislav Khodasevich, cut short his own musings about the "so-called 'Symbolist' phalanx," interjecting, "I wonder if it would not be more precise to call it 'modernist'?"[199] In 1926, he designated all of Russian "new art" in the 1890s–1900s as "the modernist school"; two years later, Khodasevich elaborated on his reasons for this usage: "Symbolism remains unexamined and apparently 'unread.' Basically, we have not even determined what Symbolism is. We have not clarified its

difference from Decadence and modernism, or their affinities [. . .] We have not drawn Symbolism's temporal borders [. . .] Really, we do not even know the names: Who is 'fully' a Symbolist? Who is 'partly,' or 'not at all'? Opinions vary and no clear answers are out there, mostly because the classification principle is missing."[200] By the early 1930s, Khodasevich was already speaking about generational cohorts within Russian modernist culture, using the term "early modernists" (*rannie modernisty*) with reference to artists who had matured aesthetically in the 1890s and early 1900s.[201] By this time, even Symbolism's staunchest former advocates among Russian exiles admitted that it was too conceptually fraught to be a useful critical term.[202] And as for Symbolism's double, Decadence, émigrés still found it handy as an intra-modernist invective but demurred when they saw it applied to modernist culture in toto.[203]

Encounters with French littérateurs further emphasized the dilemmas inherent in the notion of Symbolism.[204] At the Studio franco-russe (1929–31), a venue for émigré-French literary debates, it transpired that the French saw Symbolism as an ephemeral and inconsequential event in their cultural history, lacking a consensual definition or list of actors. Worse yet, the French scoffed at the Russian notion of their "new art" as shallow and aestheticizing in contrast to Russian Symbolism.[205] Characteristically, Nina Berberova used the modernist signifier to question the notion of Russian Symbolism in her talk at the studio, while her French interlocutors eschewed the term "modernism" as having no currency in their critical idiom.[206] Likewise, in his first English novel, *The Real Life of Sebastian Knight* (1938–39), Vladimir Nabokov spoke about "modernist authors," even putting the phrase in the mouth of a British critic, although this common Russian critical term, casually used in Nabokov's last Russian novel, *The Gift* (1938), was then extremely rare in Anglophone criticism.[207]

Georgii Adamovich, Khodasevich's opponent, similarly settled on modernism as a capacious label preferable to the "inconvenient nicknames" Symbolism and Decadence.[208] The modernist moniker spared émigré critics explanatory diatribes and grumbling asides about the shortcomings of extant "isms."[209] Consider Nikolai Otsup's terminological anxiety when, calling Adamovich "a close relative of Decadent poets and critics," he hurried to add, "Decadence, of course, has its merits and flaws [. . .] But the problem of Decadence would take us too far afield." A few pages later, in another essay, Otsup compulsively returned to the problem and solved it, at least for himself, by replacing Decadence with modernism: "I am not a fanatic of

modernism. But I believe that everything left out of this notion belongs to nineteenth-century literature and is doomed to retouch and embellish, brilliantly at times, the old edifice long abandoned by life, 'isms' of all sorts and fashion-mongering notwithstanding."[210] Otsup's statement was a rare attempt to affix the modernist tag to current émigré art and thought. More often, this "indiscriminately" generalizing term, to cite Marina Tsvetaeva's 1926 verdict, was deemed inimical for self-descriptive purposes, in contrast to its literary-historical function (Tsvetaeva used it as an umbrella epithet for all "post-Nadson" Russian poetry).[211] Since the onomastic issue was put to rest in Stalinist Russia, the problem of terminology was not as acute when exiles spoke about the Soviet field of cultural production. Here the consolidation of "isms" under the rubric of modernism worked as a polemical tool. Dismissing the Stalinist critical lexicon as "rather meaningless," Gleb Struve characterized Iurii Olesha, Veniamin Kaverin, and Valentin Kataev as "modernists" pushing "Soviet literature to learn from Proust, Joyce and Dos Passos."[212]

But if the coining of "isms" was now mocked as a throwback to the innocent days of "new art," how could exiled modernists signal their differences from each other and from those authors who, as Otsup put it, still haunted the abandoned edifice of nineteenth-century literature? And how were they to articulate their lineage to antebellum Russian modernist culture, as they were wont to do? This onomastic dilemma preoccupied the émigré modernist milieu in Paris, whose flagship journal, *Chisla* (1930–34), brought the culture's veterans and neophytes under one editorial roof as a result of economic constraints on publishing in exile. The journal made a virtue of necessity, casting its eclecticism as a willful departure from modernist factionalism.[213] Its inaugural editorial was ostentatiously noncommittal, both in the vague account of the group's agenda and in the refusal to name it.[214] This was a break with modernist practices. As Ezra Pound put it, in 1930, a magazine had to have "a clear announcement of a program—any program. A review that couldn't announce a program probably didn't know what it thought or where it was going."[215] In contrast, Adamovich, *Chisla*'s main theorist, explained in 1932, "One could, of course, invent a new movement, stoke passions around some new 'ism': but the world has grown wiser lately; 'isms' are suspect [. . .] and no unifying canon exists." Later, Adamovich listed among the group's "discoveries" its departure from modernist legitimation practices—"schools, methods, 'isms.' "[216]

Heeding this self-fashioning strategy, émigré critics located *Chisla* in the modernist historical continuum but did not try to label the group.[217] *Chisla*'s

modernist rivals, in contrast, recycled the argument so effectively tested on Acmeism two decades earlier: slaves to the "fancy for 'isms,'" the group was so pathetically helpless in aesthetic matters that it could not devise a convincing program with a name to boot.[218] Yet *Chisla* associates all but flaunted their "no logo" self-stylization. "Symbolists and Surrealists had written tomes about themselves," boasted Boris Poplavskii, "whereas new émigré literature—almost nothing."[219] Symptomatically, insider attempts at "isming" the *Chisla* coterie—to wit, Sergei Sharshun's Magic Realism proposal (1932)—fell on deaf ears.[220]

Ironically, eschewing labels and manifestos, the *Chisla* circle was the closest thing to a defined and viable literary school in Russian modernist experience. Concentrated in one locale and one periodical, whose aesthetic endured after its closure, the group had relatively clear temporal outlines (1928/29–40) and a stable membership held together by a distinct worldview, mythology, and set of practices in poetry and prose.[221] In 1927, Adamovich speculated about a nascent "Paris school of Russian poetry."[222] But the evolution of modernist culture at this stage—which I call "late Russian modernism" (see chapter 3)—discouraged "isming," making the critic loath to go any further. His modernist rivals, Khodasevich, Tsvetaeva, and Nabokov, similarly balked at "ismed" artistic agendas. This refusal of stock legitimation tools signaled a qualitatively new—and ultimate, as it turned out—iteration of Russian modernism, whose onomastic metareflection was thus left unsettled, morphing, after the Second World War, into a quest for terminological tools that could help cultural historians to map a field of scholarly inquiry.

Naming the Field

In the USSR, the issue of critical metalanguage resurfaced with the political Thaw of the late 1950s. The terms elaborated in the 1930s were now marred by unwanted Stalinist resonance. The attendant revision of critical lexicon breathed new life into underused cognomens, "modernism" in particular.[223] In 1967, Viktor Zhirmunskii summed up the decade-long onomastic revaluation: "I use the term 'modernism,' which, in recent years, has gained broad popularity in Soviet literary criticism, as the most capacious and neutral [name] for the totality of phenomena comprising new literature, from the 1880s to the present, and which were born in reaction to realism. The word 'Symbolism' refers to a narrower set of events inside modernism, [whereas] 'Decadence,' as they used to say at the century's turn, has negative evaluative connotations (the period of 'decline')." The scholar explained

modernism's superiority to other labels by the contrived nature of factional divisions in modernist culture and by the term's relative axiological neutrality.[224] Of course, his argument had to toe the official Marxist line on twentieth-century literary history as a battle of realism against bourgeois decadence-cum-formalism.[225] This Stalinist schema persisted in Soviet criticism, which thereby invested the modernist signifier with the connotations of the Stalinist invectives it replaced, effectively overshadowing Zhirmunskii's continuous insistence on the term's neutrality (cf. his essay "Anna Akhmatova and Aleksandr Blok," 1970).[226] In 1974, four decades after Gleb Struve's aforementioned dismissal of Stalinist terminology as meaningless, another émigré scholar, Victor Terras, scoffed at current Soviet usage, wherein modernism acted as "a meaningless catchall" for ideologically alien artistic practices.[227]

Modernism's growing visibility as a Soviet term of opprobrium quickened its retreat from the émigré critical idiom, reshaped by the postwar intellectual evolution of Russia Abroad under the impact of demographic attrition and new arrivals. In the early 1950s, modernism began to lose ground to another name, the Silver Age, reflecting a shift in the émigré opinion about pre-1917 modernist culture—from neutral, at best, to positive.[228] In 1951, Struve still relied on interwar terminology, calling Symbolism "a product of the general modernist movement." Within a decade, modernism took a back seat to the Silver Age.[229] At this time, the usage was too novel to sit comfortably with many littérateurs. In 1959, Boris Zaitsev, a cultural conservative, invoked the Silver Age, in its traditional sense of inferiority, to stress modernism's flaws vis-à-vis nineteenth-century art. Three years later, *Apollon*'s former editor, Sergei Makovskii, used the Silver Age as a positive marker in the title of his book of memoirs, as well as in its introduction and conclusion. Yet the main body of the narrative eschewed the trendy moniker in favor of older umbrella terms—modernism and Symbolism.[230] Imported into the USSR at the time when the artistic legacy of Russian modernist culture was unofficially "enjoying a full-blown renaissance," as Akhmatova noted in 1964, the newly minted émigré tag became a marker of intellectual dissidence against the backdrop of modernism's low status in the Soviet critical discourse.[231]

The history of the Silver Age as a signifier of Russian modernist culture, studied by Omry Ronen, Galina Rylkova, and Alexander Dolinin, need not detain us here. Suffice it to say that this usage—traced, variously, to Pëtr Pertsov (1914), R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik and Vladimir Piast (USSR, 1920s),

Aleksandr Amfiteatrov (Florence, 1927), and Nikolai Otsup and Vladimir Veidle (Paris, 1930s)—had no currency in the Russian critical lexicon prior to the late 1940s and meant many things before coming to signify an entirely positive view of prerevolutionary modernism.[232] The term's fraught history and semantics surely warrant Ronen's objections to its suitability for modernist studies.[233] Furthermore, the inherent chronological bias of the myth denoted by the Silver Age moniker—positing the year 1917 as the upper temporal boundary of a modernist Eden smothered by Communism—truncates Russian modernist culture by some twenty years, obfuscating its life in the USSR and in exile (see chapter 3). As Dolinin has shown, the sole exception to this chronological practice is found in Iurii Ivask's 1949 essay, "The Silver Age," which dismissed the term modernism as "nonsensical," replacing it with the Silver Age to denote the entire historical and geographic span of Russian modernism at home and in exile.[234]

Symptomatically, in 1954, Vladimir Markov complained that his incipient study of Futurism fit badly into "the two to three decades we call the Silver Age."[235] The same problem dogged Adamovich's retrospective treatment of the *Chisla* circle as part of "the Russian cultural renaissance, or as they say nowadays, the Silver Age." The critic favored "modernism" over the newer term, because "the literary period conventionally dubbed Decadence or modernism" had only "seemed to have breathed its last in 1917 [. . .] reviving soon afterward in new forms, in a new 'iteration,' as it were." Signaling the continuity of Russian "new art" beyond the political boundary of 1917, Adamovich now extended by two decades the temporal scope of the modernist concept, which interwar émigré critics had confined to the quarter century preceding the Bolshevik coup.[236]

A factor playing in favor of modernism as a chronologically and typologically inclusive concept was the gradual realization among cultural historians that artistic factionalism could not be taken at face value. This idea took decades to find traction in literary scholarship. To be sure, in 1954, Markov already likened modernist "isms" to "bacteria revealed in a drop of water," to argue that "the thorough knowledge of movements does little for our understanding of the literary process. Scholarly attention to manifestos, credos, and group leaders' statements is not very justified [. . .] for these literary 'politics' blow unimportant things out of proportion, obscuring what is indeed vital [. . .] Scholars would do better to focus on fleshing out the underlying idea of a poetic practice on its own terms, discarding the chaff of literary fashions and the stuff of literary politics."[237] This was easier said

than done. Despite this statement of principle, Markov's work was guided by the self-description of the objects of his research. His recommendation would be embraced only in the 1990s, when the emancipation of Russian literary studies from the ideological coordinates of the Soviet period shifted scholarly attention to the overarching continuities of modernist culture.[238]

Such slow progress toward integrative methodology and its attendant metalanguage owed much to the political context. In the USSR, thanks to the ideological sensitivity of their subject matter, students of modernism had to negotiate the dearth of primary sources and censorship. Hence their factographic, bibliographic, and textological focus at the expense of theoretical reflection. Besides, such empirical methodology had the benefit of offering an alternative to the Marxist manipulation of history.[239] So much of the modernist legacy was obfuscated in the USSR that the main scholarly effort went into the factual reconstruction of Russian modernist culture. In the process, scholars relied on the partisan self-descriptions of the objects of their cultural archeology. And, given the negative value of the term and concept of modernism in official Soviet usage, dissenting scholars favored other terms, historical self-appellations (Symbolism, Futurism, Acmeism, etc.) being the most natural choice.

This practice proved problematic in the way it shaped academic inquiry. The modernist lexicon of self-legitimation did not remain a metadescriptive tool only—it directed and motivated research. Thus, the decades-long effort to define Futurism finally made Mikhail Gasparov doubt its terminological and conceptual usefulness.[240] Similarly, if inquiries into the poetics of individual self-styled Acmeists were quite fruitful, all attempts to define Acmeism were thwarted by the heterogeneity of the textual corpus in question and its continuity with differently labeled modernist poetic practices.[241] Yet one could not openly dismiss the notion of Acmeism, for this would have amounted to endorsing the Soviet vision of modernist "isms" as speculative amusements of the decadent bourgeoisie. Before the 1990s, such methodological aporias of Russian modernist studies were swept under the rug for the sake of "countering totalitarianism" (Segal), as in the case of the famous collective essay on "Russian Semantic Poetics" (1974), whose conceptual framework was more a challenge to Soviet critical orthodoxy than a meaningful step toward defining Acmeism as a distinct literary practice or school.[242]

Students of Russian modernism in the West, although not exposed to the same pressures as their Soviet colleagues, initially shared their method-

ological premises and terminological choices. In *The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry* (1958), Georgette Donchin paid tribute to Mirskii's forceful terminological advocacy of modernism as "probably correct" and used that epithet in the book's introduction. Yet, stating her onomastic preference in the study's title, Donchin went on to apply the Symbolist tag, indiscriminately and without motivation, to all poets active in early Russian modernist culture.[243] Two decades later, Patricia Carden similarly used ornamentalism as a generic label for "the style of various Russian prose writers in the first three decades of the century." Unlike Donchin, Carden was compelled to explain her usage ("ornamentalism is simply the name attached to the appearance of modernism in Russian prose"), because she was writing for a volume—*Russian Modernism: Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900–1930* (1976)—that problematized extant terminology as an urgent methodological issue. Wrote the volume's editor, George Gibian: "The meanings given by the authors to the word modernism vary considerably. The richness (and in some cases, the inconsistencies and contradictions) of the interpretation of modernism (and its sister concept avant-garde) are in themselves one of the illuminations yielded by this volume. We cannot claim to have settled the issue of the term's significance."[244] Concurrently, Markov broached the same issue, suggesting a history of Russian "new art" made up of "so-called 'modernism' " and the "so-called 'avant-garde.' "[245] Another metalinguistic event came from the other side of the Iron Curtain. In her 1979 monograph, Lidiia Ginzburg, a veteran of Russian modernist culture, used a hidden digression to question the use of modernism as an all-purpose Soviet insult. Discussing "a complex interrelation of the realist tradition with the trends that, for all their variety, were conventionally grouped in the inconvenient term modernism," Ginzburg explained, "It is inconvenient by virtue of equivocality (modernism—with reference to century-old phenomena) and by the diversity of the currents the term embraces [. . .] But since we do not have another term, we must use this one, for it summarizes the general tendencies discernible in the cacophony of twentieth-century literary movements."[246] Like Zhirmunskii, Ginzburg accepted the boundaries set for modernism in Soviet criticism, where the concept denoted all art deemed non-realist, from the fin-de-siècle to the present, in contrast to her private use of modernism, back in the 1940s, as a literary-historical marker for the first two decades of Russian "new art." Gibian's modernism covered the years 1900–30; John Bowlt applied this concept, in 1985, to "the approximate period of 1900 to 1925," to "denote a chronology of ideas and personalities rather than a par-

ticular style"—a notable departure from Carden's practice. Bowlt also tried, inconclusively, to solve the onomastic rivalry of modernism and the avant-garde by outlining continuities between early modernist aesthetics and those Markov placed under the avant-garde rubric (from Cubo-Futurism onward).[247] Meanwhile, Ginzburg threw another challenge to Soviet critical orthodoxy, narrowing "the vague notion of modernism" and dismissing the Stalinist dichotomy of modernism and realism. For her, modernism was the next best thing to "the missing generic term denoting certain trends in the art of the late nineteenth and twentieth centuries, trends that peaked in the first quarter of the twentieth century, in the prose of Proust, Joyce, and Kafka [. . .] Modernism's search for 'true reality' aspired to radical transformation, to a break with tradition, and to the discovery of premises for the new understanding of the human being."[248]

In the 1980s, as Western Russianists moved toward a synthesizing vision of modernist culture, they experienced the modernist epithet as a novel onomastic tool, testing it apprehensively. Henryk Baran, for example, used modernism, in 1982, as the umbrella appellation for all "new" prose, from Belyi and Sologub to Khlebnikov and Mandel'shtam. Four years later, he retracted this usage, defending instead the "differentiating concept of the 'poetic school,'" Symbolism and Futurism above all, against "the attractive but excessively generalizing notion of 'modernism.'" Then, in 1993, Baran returned to modernism as the most useful, because neutral and inclusive, term.[249] Throughout the 1980s, Western scholars also moved closer to a consensus on thorny terminological issues. Symbolism was finally recognized as a "rather approximate" and "misleading" label (Peterson) whose fluid signified was best treated as a subspecies of modernism.[250] Meanwhile, in the USSR, Iu. M. Lotman and Z. G. Mints, who had hitherto distinguished Symbolism from modernism, began to cast Symbolism as modernism's component and to question the expediency of the Silver Age moniker.[251] In the 1990s, this usage went mainstream. Modernism became "a period umbrella for contemporaneous or successive modern 'isms' such as Symbolism, Expressionism, Futurism" (Erlich), whose definitions remained stubbornly problematic.[252]

Such onomastic evolution was too precipitous for some scholars. An otherwise iconoclastic French project on Russian literary history (1987–88) barely touched on the issue of metalanguage.[253] Similarly, contributors to the volume honoring Vladimir Markov as an "authority on twentieth-century Russian modernism" (*Readings in Russian Modernism*, 1993) seldom employed that term in their essays, relying instead on the self-appellations of modern-

ist factions.[254] Like Donchin thirty-five years earlier, Avril Pyman applied the titular epithet of her *History of Russian Symbolism* (1994) to a broad variety of artists, running into the usual conceptual dilemmas, which forced her repeatedly to fall back on the modernist signifier. Finally, a number of scholars reluctant to give up on Symbolism as an umbrella term tried to remedy its chronological limitations with the notion of post-Symbolism, hitherto used rarely to designate Russian modernism in the 1910s–20s.[255] The term and concept of post-Symbolism promised to solve a key problem in the periodization of Russian "new art" by accounting for the continuous creative activity of early modernists.[256] In practice, however, post-Symbolism was invoked in so many different and contradictory senses—not least because of the polysemy of Symbolism—that the usage faded away in the first decade of this century.[257] The term "avant-garde" has not fared much better, its semantic vacuity growing in equal measure to its trendiness in post-Soviet scholarship.[258]

Scholars rallying to modernism as a metalinguistic tool were keenly aware of its semantic discrepancy in Russian and Anglo-American literary studies, and of resistance to it among Russianists.[259] Books appearing in the 1990s—the seminal essay collection, *Creating Life: The Aesthetic Utopia of Russian Modernism* (eds. Irina Paperno and Joan Grossman); Roger Keys's study of Belyi, *The Reluctant Modernist*; Hilary Fink's *Bergson and Russian Modernism*—still justified their usage, appealing to Russian modernist studies' post-Soviet cognitive advances and shift toward a synthesizing vision of their subject matter. A corollary of modernism's rising terminological fortunes was the fall from grace of the Silver Age, whose growing terminological and conceptual irrelevance was predicated on the changed political context.[260] True, the terminological uncertainty Keys pinpointed in Russian modernist studies has not been resolved twenty years on. The field's old onomastic habits have proven more durable than they seemed in the heady days following the Soviet collapse.[261] Besides, no terminological consensus is possible without the resolution of other unsettled methodological issues, such as the temporal scope of Russian modernism (see chapter 3) and its relation to the notion of the avant-garde (see chapter 2). But at least today's Russian cultural historians are no longer compelled to justify their terminological choice of the notoriously "vague" and "ugly" word "modernism," which has entered the scholarly mainstream.

Iurii Tynianov's preoccupation with critical terminology, cited at the beginning of this chapter, expressed the literary historian's awareness of the

power of metalanguage to shape the course of scholarly inquiry. Tynianov knew firsthand that an uncritically accepted term could create a semblance of reality with no ground in historical fact. The goal of this chapter has been to put critical distance between the explorers of Russian modernist culture and its "misty lands," as Aleksandr Blok put it (see the introduction). Yet we still need a descriptive language whose terms strike a reasonable balance between the original usage of modernism's historical actors and the anachronistic perspective imposed by the scholarly prerogatives of our cultural cartography of the modernist terrain. It is, then, my contention that "modernism," despite its inherent flaws and tortuous trajectory, is the least bad option for a generic umbrella term denoting, in shorthand, a Russian cultural formation that existed from the turn of the century until the fall of Paris in 1940.

2 The Errant Compass Rose of Russian Modernist Studies

Literary and cultural historians conventionally frame modernism as a philosophical and aesthetic reaction to *realism* and *tradition*. If we were to chart this stock view of modernism, the resultant map would feature a compass rose whose cardinal directions read: Realism, Anti-realism, Tradition, Innovation. However, equipped with such a map, academic explorers of the modernist terrain have regularly stumbled into the predicament of the seafarers from Jules Verne's novel *A Captain at Fifteen* (1878), who set course for South America but sailed to Africa because of a faulty compass. The problem is that the contrastive pairs—realism/anti-realism, tradition/innovation—could work as tools of definition and taxonomy only if the meanings of their constituent parts were reasonably clear and stable. But they are nothing of the sort.

The compass roses guiding our cartography of the modernist terrain contradict each other. Our mental maps show the cardinal directions every which way, because the sense of each direction fluctuates—one critic's realism is another's anti-realism, and what is meant by tradition at one historical moment is understood as innovation in another. The criteria of anti-realism and innovation are so routinely cited to distinguish modernist practices from non-modernist that they have become central to our research methodology. Yet, despite their seeming expedience, these criteria hinder the identification and assessment of modernist authors and artifacts.

In recent years, working on Anglo-American material, the new modernist studies have begun to question the academic field's traditional classification criteria. Thomas Davis has argued against "the conventional wisdom that positions modernism and realism as dialectical opposites." Other scholars, notably Robert Scholes, have exposed the historical role of such criteria in the partisan codification of the *high modernist* canon. This canon, created

for the (self-)promotion of a group of Anglophone writers, redirects scholarly attention from modernist culture at large toward "a privileged piece (and probably a very small piece) of this crucial early-twentieth-century formation," notes Deborah Jacobs in her critique of the scholarly tendency to explore modernism "from within its own politics and prejudices."[1]

Building on these methodological advances, this chapter explores the thorny issue of modernist taxonomy on Russian material, which yields valuable additional insights into the history and uses of the classification principles that inform our mental maps of Russian and transnational modernism.

Realism as a Cardinal Direction

It is part of the stock-in-trade of current scholarship to treat European artistic life as split, beginning in the 1880s, into two antithetical camps, modernist and realist, and, consequently, to describe the aesthetic and intellectual peculiarities of modernism as an anti-realist reaction.[2] The dichotomy is particularly stark when used for definitional purposes, as in the following recent statement: "Modernism did not exist as a homogeneous, uniform, empirical phenomenon but it could be construed as a theoretical model having various appearances or paradigms characterized by one common aesthetic denominator: a radical break with the mimetic tradition of the nineteenth-century Realism."[3] As a methodological tenet, this anti-realist paradigm glosses over the problematic historical origins of the realist/modernist juxtaposition. In Russia, the realist/modernist dichotomy originated in the defensive tactics of the fin-de-siècle literary establishment, whose gatekeepers—philosophical positivists and social utilitarians—fended off the modernist threat by imputing to its carriers the desire to destroy realism in art. The accusation implied a departure from the ideology and artistic philosophy forged in the intelligentsia culture in the 1850s-60s.[4] As often happened in Russian modernist culture, its actors appropriated the insulting label of anti-realism as a device for brazen self-promotion. The two uses of the anti-realist critical trope coexisted and endured. Advocates of "new art" found much rhetorical value in the juxtaposition of "degenerating realism" and modernism, making the latter synonymous with "all that was talented and alive in Russian literature."[5] In contrast, the traditional intelligentsia and early Russian Marxists, and Stalinist ideologues after them, built a similarly rigid opposition between "degenerate" modernist practices and their thriving realist alternatives.[6]

As Russian "new art" rose to prominence after 1905, the realist/modernist

juxtaposition doubled its appeal, now as a convenient way to describe the national field of cultural production by reducing it to "two, almost watertight, sections" (Mirskii), even if the actual sorting of actors into the "perennially feuding camps" of realism and modernism (Vengerova) varied by critic.[7] After Lenin's coup, the rhetorical function of the realist/modernist contrast redoubled its original ideological rationale: realism became a marker of Communist allegiances in the critical discourse of Soviet Marxists.[8] Throughout the 1920s, the diversity of Russian artistic life, spread across interwar Europe, did not fit into the Procrustean bed of the nascent Soviet aesthetic, whose acolytes struggled to rationalize the emigration of many non-modernist authors, in contrast to the persistence of modernist practices among the Bolshevik regime's loyalists. But these difficulties were ultimately swept under the Stalinist rug as Soviet critics learned to adapt their taxonomy to political circumstances, stripping officially censured artists of realist credentials or returning rehabilitated ones from the modernist wilderness into the realist fold.[9]

Except for a brief moment during the political Thaw of the late 1950s, when it became possible to discuss openly the problematic nature of the term and concept of realism, such ideological utilization of the realist/modernist contrast persisted in Soviet scholarship until the USSR's demise.[10] Meanwhile, Western students of transnational modernism absorbed the anti-realist paradigm via Georg Lukács's writings, the impact of which continues to be felt today despite their Stalinist premises, which have been decried by Lidiia Ginzburg as "the fallacy of the mechanistic sorting of twentieth-century writers into modernists and realists, most often on the basis of purely external and secondary features."[11]

In sum, our academic field has been shaped by the anti-realist paradigm, whose original—ideological and polemical—rationale is obscured by the long afterlife of the modernist/realist dichotomy in both Russian and Western scholarly discourses. This critical paradigm has little explanatory value outside specific historical circumstances, and even less utility as a taxonomical tool. It exaggerates divergences and obfuscates continuities between the traditional intelligentsia's philosophy and aesthetics, dominant in fin-de-siècle Russia, and their modernist challengers. True, these divergences, especially the modernist revision of art's epistemological and referential premises, are genuine, but they cannot be reduced to a realist/modernist dichotomy, no matter how broadly understood.

A great deal of historical evidence shows that, in Russia, many self-styled

Realists—I capitalize the term only when speaking about artists who used it for self-description—imbibed modernist ontological doubt and the attendant quest for higher, nonmaterial(istic) reality. Russian "new art," in turn, retained much from the intellectual and artistic legacy of the nineteenth-century Realist school, even claiming to be its principal heir. When they did not exploit the anti-realist paradigm as a tool of cheeky self-affirmation, modernists turned the tables on the intelligentsia aesthetic, debunking its naïve, and therefore hardly realist, reliance on the referential illusion—the assumption that art faithfully mirrored the outside world, perceived by the senses and construed as reality. At issue was not whether modernists were fleeing reality, as their detractors claimed, but their novel understanding of reality and, by the same token, of artistic realism.

The parameters of the realist/modernist dichotomy fail to do justice to the quarrel about the nature of reality in fin-de-siècle Russian intellectual life. This quarrel pitted the majority opinion against the carriers of the "new sensibility," who called into doubt the social, historical, and biological determinism of the hitherto dominant ideas about the world and the individual. In contrast to the mainstream intelligentsia outlook, absorbed by Russian Marxists, modernists stressed the limits of rational cognition, defying core positivist assumptions about the exhaustive definitiveness of empirical reality and, as a result, about artistic referentiality.[12] Hence the virulent reaction of the intelligentsia critics, like the advocate of the Itinerant painters Vladimir Stasov, to early modernist attacks on the mimetic conventions dominant at the century's turn.

Stasov viewed the modernist assault on the Realist school in Russian painting as going beyond artistic matters. Indeed, rather than dismiss the Realist canon, modernists polemically appropriated it, sapping its positivist rationale and casting themselves as better realists than the self-styled Realists of the preceding decades.[13] They even wrested from the Realist school its central metaphor of art as a mirror of life, turning that mirror inward, so it would reflect art's creator and the creative process.[14] Mocking the positivist aesthetic that modeled reality as a system of observable and knowable facts, early modernists located reality beyond the realm of rational cognition. In the process, they revived the romantic cult of genius, the better to cast reality as something that could only be intuited by the spiritually gifted in the act of artistic creation, and capitalized on romanticism's dualist worldview by fusing the mundane and the otherworldly.[15]

Early Russian modernists freed empirical reality from the shackles of the

positivist worldview by conceptualizing it as a deceptive veil thrown across another, metaphysical, reality that could be revealed in traditional artistic media as well as in everyday life, mythopoetically respiritualized through aesthetically meaningful behavior dubbed *zhiznetvorchestvo*, or "life-creation."[16] Later modernist cohorts persisted in the practice of life-creation but shifted their search for nonmaterial(istic) reality to human consciousness, viewing the world as a construct of the psyche. As psychological solipsism supplanted, in the 1910s, the earlier metaphysical aspirations of "new art," the balance of mystical transcendentalism and depth psychology in the modernist understanding of reality tipped toward the latter.[17] This qualitative change marked Russian modernism's passage to a new historical stage, which I call "high modernism" (see chapter 3). The development echoed similar events abroad, running parallel to the rise of the "realism of consciousness," which, in Virginia Woolf's words, came "closer to life" than the realism of the "materialists" and, as Erich Auerbach argued, generated new mimetic conventions, making Woolf's and Proust's novels as realistic as Balzac's. In keeping with this logic, Ezra Pound described James Joyce's *Ulysses*, in 1922, as "a realist novel by definition."[18] Finally, the inward reorientation of the Russian modernist quest for higher reality stimulated engagement with Freudian theories, particularly among self-styled Futurists (Khlebnikov, Kruchenykh, Terent'ev, Zdanevich), anticipating a similar interest among French Surrealists.[19]

The pursuit of true reality, otherworldly or psychological, was germane to all historical stages of Russian modernist culture, traveling under the slogan *a realibus ad realiora*, from the real to the more real. Tentative names for this quest—Viacheslav Ivanov's "realistic symbolism" and "realiorism," Pavel Filonov's "naturalism squared," Kazimir Malevich's "transmental realism," Nikolai Chuzhak's "ultra-realism," Sergei Sharshun's "magical realism"—failed to catch on, unlike their French equivalent, surrealism.[20] Nonetheless, obsessed with the issue of *what is really real*, and looking for answers in mystical, philosophical, and psychological doctrines as well as in the natural sciences, Russian modernists fashioned themselves as genuine realists who spurned superficial and naïve positivist mimesis.[21] The widely shared assumptions concerning higher reality's noncoincidence with empirical experience, its imperviousness to rational cognition, and the inherent difficulty of its artistic articulation informed two overarching premises of Russian modernist culture. One held that art was the most congenial medium for higher cognition thanks to the unique qualification of "genuine" artists to

intuit or (re-)construct the true order of existence, since they had the exclusive gifts—linguistic, psychological, spiritual, and the like—to surpass the limitations of the intellect and senses.[22] Another enduring premise was the view of language as a faulty tool for conveying human experience, summed up by the oft-cited line from Fëdor Tiutchev's poem "Silentium" (1830), "An uttered thought is a lie."

Such consciousness of the expressive inadequacy of language invalidated the referential illusion for actors in Russian modernist culture, whose five-decade history, punctuated by tentative responses to Tiutchev's dictum, can be imagined as an uninterrupted quest to approximate the subject's idiosyncratic experience of reality, however construed. This quest began with the search for linguistic signs, called "symbols" in early modernism, allusive and capacious enough to imply more than they said, but without morphing into allegory, which only faked unspoken meaning.[23] This initial quest persisted in all its aspects—mythical, intertextual, morphological, phonetic, semantic—throughout Russian modernist experience, with each cohort and current claiming to have come closer to resolving Tiutchev's paradox.[24]

The need to problematize the anti-realist paradigm in modernist studies is, then, most apparent in light of the vacuity of the concept of realism. Defining modernism as a reaction to realism, we assume that the notion of realism is both alien to modernist aspirations and clear enough to act as a contrastive foil. Neither, of course, is the case. In the 1920s, when public expressions of doubt were still permissible, even Soviet Marxists rued the "vagueness and dubiousness of the term 'realism' which lacked theoretical clarity."[25] In 1921, Roman Jakobson tried his hand at such a clarification. Mocking current invocations of realism, Jakobson called them flawed for confusing the artist's articulation of reality with the public's reaction to that effort, a reaction often revealing incompatibility between the artist's and the public's ideas of what constituted reality and how it should properly be depicted. No artistic trend, Jakobson argued, had ultimate answers to these questions. Neoclassicists, romantics, self-designated Realists and Naturalists, as well as modernists of all stripes had gone on record claiming to represent reality ever more faithfully, only to be rebuffed by audiences and each other, concluded Jakobson.[26]

But even restricting realism's meaning to the nineteenth-century Realist school in literature and painting—informed by philosophical positivism and grounded in the referential illusion—students of modernism will not get very far, since the mimetic practices in question are too historically intertwined

with their alleged romantic and modernist opposites to serve as useful reference points for definitional and taxonomical purposes. Here a historical recap is in order.

Occasionally applied by French critics to Balzac, Stendhal, and Hugo in the 1830s–40s, the term and concept of "realism" became conventional in the 1850s, acquiring the connotations of political radicalism in the revolutionary year 1848. The earliest English use of "realism" as a marker of a literary method, with reference to Balzac, came in 1853.[27] Realism shaped up as a distinct eponymous artistic program in the wake of Gustave Courbet's 1855 secessionist exhibit (*Pavillon du réalisme*), followed by the launch of Edmond Duranty's review, *Le Réalisme* (1856). Setting a recurrent pattern, Courbet insisted that the label of Realism was imposed on him by hostile critics and that he accepted it out of spite. Be that as it may, Courbet's artistic philosophy was thoroughly romantic: fusing social radicalism with bohemianism, he subscribed to the idea of the artist as a seer and prophet. Realism was initially understood in France as a complement to romanticism, since both outlooks were obsessed with socioeconomic modernity and rejected the neoclassical aesthetic. In the 1860s, Realism and romanticism evolved into countervailing artistic critiques of modernity, dubbed Naturalism and Aestheticism, respectively, the former describing modern life, the latter bemoaning it.

Romanticism's proximity to Realism informed Charles Baudelaire's reaction to the second concept, which he, like Courbet, initially mocked as fictitious. For Baudelaire, all art was realist inasmuch as it sought true reality beyond the visible. The poet thus opposed his own transcendental longing to Courbet's philosophical materialism, which contemporary French critics identified as the basis of the Realist school. But, since the genie was out of the bottle, Baudelaire acquiesced to the "vague and elastic term" Realism, with a caveat: "Contrary to its vulgar meaning as a detailed depiction of accessories," this word should mean, he argued, the "new creative method" manifest in *Madame Bovary* (1856). Symptomatically, it was the tense cohabitation of Realist and romantic poetics in Gustave Flaubert's writing that made his novel no less important a model for modernist prose than Baudelaire's verse collection, *Les Fleurs du mal* (1857), for modernist poetry, or the Pre-Raphaelite visual legacy for modernist painting.[28]

Even polarized into Naturalist and Aesthetic currents, Realism and romanticism persisted in an intimate relationship informed by a single protomodernist sensibility. The Goncourt brothers' aesthetic program, despite its

association with Emile Zola, Naturalism's firebrand, ran parallel to John Ruskin's and William Morris's agendas, which some scholars view as late romantic and others as early modernist. As collectors and critics, the Goncourts did in France what Ruskin and Morris endeavored in England: they articulated the superiority of craft arts to industrial commercialism, willy-nilly laying theoretical and visual bases for the turn-of-the-century *style moderne*.[29] Literary politics obscured fundamental continuities linking Naturalism to Aestheticism as artistic phenomena coextensive enough to let Zola's epigone, Joris-Karl Huysmans, write *À rebours* (*Against Nature*, 1884) as both a manifesto of modernism and a spoof of it. The novel's duality drew on the shared intellectual sources of the Naturalists and Aesthetes (rebranded Decadents in the 1880s) in the current scientific discourse, clinical psychiatry in particular, which was intensely preoccupied with the topic of degeneration.

Jean-Marie Charcot's and Hippolyte Bernheim's studies of the unconscious gave artists new insights into the human psyche, enabling a reevaluation of the extant conceptions of reality long before the spread of Freudian theories. Characteristically, the same scientific discourse, draped in the mantle of positivism, informed Zola's and Edmond de Goncourt's Naturalist method, wherein the Realist school reached its acme, and motivated the anti-Naturalist and anti-positivist ethos of early modernism. French Naturalism and modernism were equally invested in the scientific narrative about degeneration as modernity's fallout, translating this narrative into theories of cultural and spiritual crisis that gave meaning to creative activity. Scientists then used the artifacts illustrating these theories as empirical evidence for their own theories of degeneration. Such circularity was manifest in established science—witness Charcot's engagement with the contemporary art scene—and in popular science, on display in Max Nordau's *Degeneration* (1892). Both, however, saw more similarities than differences between Naturalism and its supposed modernist foil.[30] Symptomatically, contemplating the legacy of French Realism, Russian modernist author Vasilii Rozanov concluded, in 1904, that "Symbolism and Decadence were not a distinct new school that emerged in France and spread across Europe, but rather a conclusion, a summit, a bridgehead of another lasting school [. . .] *ultra-Realism*," by which he meant Naturalism.[31]

Russian literary history echoed this dynamic.[32] Here, too, there was much continuity between the Realist school and its purported opposites. Like its French equivalent, the Russian Realist aesthetic was a child of the radical

Left, epitomized by Nikolai Chernyshevskii. Like their French colleagues, Russia's self-designated Realists ostensibly opposed the philosophical idealism of the romantic age, swearing by positive reason, empirical cognition, and social utilitarianism. And, like the French, they imbibed the romantic sensibility that informed their cult of the artist's moral and spiritual authority; their anti-capitalism, which clashed with the Realist profession of such capitalist virtues as materialism and utilitarianism; and their projection of aesthetic norms on extra-artistic reality. Chernyshevskii's thesis about life's primacy over art relied on the vision of empirical reality as the exclusive realm of the beautiful. As a result, the Russian Realist school viewed art as subservient to life, while unwittingly aestheticizing extra-artistic reality, and thus echoing art's encroachment on life in romanticism and modernism.[33] This paradox was not lost on modernist polemicists, who refuted accusations of anti-realism by casting their positivist foes as the naïve carriers of that very idealism they denounced in "new art."[34]

Russian Realists and modernists shared romanticism's mythopoetic vision of the artist and the world, merging it with the ethos of positivism. Witness the plethora of Marxist Nietzscheans in Russia or the importance of Chernyshevskii's ideas about "new people" in Dmitrii Merezhkovskii's and Zinaida Gippius's ostensibly Nietzschean theories of spiritual rebirth.[35] It is no accident that Viktor Burenin, an aesthetic and social conservative, saw Gorky's "extreme realism" as an expression of "the filth of 'decadence' and 'modernism.' "[36] Nor should we be surprised that modernist mystics like Andrei Belyi, Aleksandr Blok, Nikolai Fedorov, and Vladimir Solov'ev were versed in recent scientific theories and nurtured the materialist hope for the literal realization of their utopian schemes. What separated Russian modernists from the positivist cult of science was their understanding of rational cognition as a means to spiritual and metaphysical ends.[37] Hence Viktor Zhirmunskii's 1914 defense of "modern mysticism" as "mystical realism." The modernist critic understood the latter concept as a fusion of romanticism's "realist worldview" (so defined because romantic authors believed in the empirical truth of mystical experience) with "positivism and literary Naturalism," which taught modernists to appreciate the minutiae of everyday life—a skill instrumental to their ultimate goal of (re-)spiritualizing living matter.[38] The practice of appealing to science to debunk the positivist idea of reality and the concomitant Realist mimesis punctuated all historical stages of Russian modernist culture. We still find it in Vladimir Nabokov's magnum opus, *The Gift* (*Dar*, 1937–38), whose protagonist writes a satirical

biography of Chernyshevskii to polemicize with Russia's self-styled materialists as "the naivest of metaphysicians."[39]

The twentieth-century epigones of the Russian Realist school castigated "modern mystics," while sharing their idealistic aspirations. The Marxist God-builders—Aleksandr Bogdanov, Gorky, Anatolii Lunacharskii—are cases in point. Their command of the philosophical and aesthetic premises of "new art" echoed the familiarity with the Realist canon among their modernist foes, who had imbibed that canon from youth. Logically, then, Russian modernist culture inherited the Realist school's utilitarianism and tried to reconcile it with its own ideal of artistic autonomy by replacing the intelligentsia's sociopolitical focus with other, ontological and epistemological, concerns.[40] Nominally rejecting it, modernists capitalized on the Realist understanding of art as a tool of social reform, though they replaced this materialist agenda with a striving for metaphysical and psychological transcendence. This striving did not abate in interwar years, simultaneously informing the ethos of psychic engineering in the LEF and Constructivist circles in the USSR and the proto-existentialist worldview of émigré modernists in France.

What matters, then, is less the actual divergence of canonical and nascent artistic philosophies and practices in fin-de-siècle Russia than the hyperbolic exploitation of this divergence to polemical ends. The intelligentsia opinion charged early modernists with voiding art's social mission and creating "art for art's sake." The accused, when they did not flaunt the bugaboo of "pure aestheticism" to the end of self-promotion, retorted by casting "new art" as more *engagé* than the Realist aesthetic, whose shallow materialism could not match the social import of their own transcendental quest.[41] The polemical terms cut both ways. Shielding "new art" from external foes, Briusov vaunted the preeminence of ethics over aesthetics in Merezhkovskii's idea-driven novels of mystical historiosophy as proof of the Realist tradition's continuity in modernism. Yet, debating Viacheslav Ivanov and Belyi, Briusov condemned that same ethical prerogative as the old-style utilitarian exploitation of art, albeit to metaphysical rather than sociopolitical ends. Belyi proudly admitted to the utilization of art as a tool of mystical cognition and imputed to Briusov aberrant "pure aestheticism." Taking a page from the positivist playbook, Belyi hurled the insult of "art for art's sake" at modernist opponents, while defending modernism at large from the same charge.[42] And just as the exaggeration of modernism's divergence from the Realist praxis was a handy polemical tool, modernist claims to ever-greater realism had many uses in literary politics. The interpretation of Chekhov's oeuvre

and the debates accompanying a generational shift in the modernist culture of the 1910s exemplify these uses.

Advocates of "new art" piggybacked on Chekhov's fame by casting him as an "impressionist close to the modern artistic generation" (Merezhkovskii) and a fellow victim of the intelligentsia establishment (Pertsov). Despite Chekhov's deference to the Realist school's mimetic conventions, his oeuvre's anti-didactic ambiguity and lack of open social commitment left room for casting the author as intent on "killing Realism" (Gorky).[43] Modernists even called Chekhov a fellow mystic, sowing the seeds of future Soviet anxiety about the writer's role in "new art."[44] Chekhov, of course, demurred. He brushed off the overtures of modernist publishers, citing philosophical differences with the likes of Merezhkovskii, who later admitted that of all the attempts to link Chekhov to a cause—"positivist, Socialist, Marxist, Populist, Decadent, and even mystical—the last one was particularly implausible."[45] Yet the polemical appropriation of Chekhov was too tempting, for it went a long way to advance the modernist project of reinterpreting the Realist canon and thus recoding and monopolizing the very notion of artistic realism.[46]

Consider Belyi's circuitous argument. He started by classifying Chekhov as an exponent of the Chernyshevskii tradition, in other words, as part of the Realist school. In the next breath, he interpreted Chekhov's oeuvre as attuned to modernity and, by this token, essentially Symbolist. To reconcile the two statements, Belyi claimed that Chekhov was unaware of the true nature of his artistic vision. In Belyi's opinion, Chekhov intuitively moved "from naïve realism to deeper realism," demonstrating the dynamic of modernist art. Chekhov's artistic evolution, Belyi summed up, belied the positivist critique of "new art," which absorbed the legacy of the Realist school, taking it to a higher, more realist plane.[47]

Similar claims to ever-greater realism punctuated intra-modernist debates, functioning as rhetorical devices for factional and generational legitimation. Such claims were particularly common in the 1910s, when the evolution of Russian "new art" ran parallel to that of Anglo-American modernism, whose budding cohort, that of Joyce and Pound, assailed the metaphysical transcendentalism of its teachers in the name of greater realism and simplicity.[48] In Russia, too, the feuding offshoots of early modernism voiced an emphatically realist distaste for the mysticism and vagueness of their mentors. This did not preclude hermeticism and transcendental aspirations—more psychological than metaphysical—in the young cohort's writings. The

self-designated Acmeists, for example, presented their program as "neo-realist" by virtue of greater clarity and a renewed focus on empirical reality. In practice, their poetry was hardly clearer than that of the early modernists, whose quest for true reality—with a focus on the artist, creative process, and linguistic material—the Acmeists upheld.[49] Characteristically, the Acmeists distinguished their "new realism" from the "philistine realism" of the Realist school, while dismissing the rival claims to higher realism emanating from their modernist peers and predecessors.[50]

Responses to the Acmeist agenda expose the fluidity and versatility of the notion of realism. Zhirmunskii, Acmeism's advocate, insisted on the "neo-realist" quality of psychological solipsism, aesthetic metareflection, linguistic experiment, and even mysticism in the poetry of Akhmatova, Gumilev, and Mandel'shtam. This "new realism," he argued, carried on the early modernist quest *a realibus ad realiora*, which had supplanted the Realist school's naïve positivism—a view Zhirmunskii recanted in a mea culpa prefacing the Soviet publication of his censored writings.[51] Even adepts of the Chernyshevskii tradition initially hailed Acmeist declarations as a return to the Realist aesthetic, only to be upbraided by the demurring Acmeists.[52] Modernist competitors, in turn, dismissed "Acmeist realism" as a positivist anachronism, in contrast to their own search for higher reality.[53] Subsequent evaluations of Acmeist realism reflected the historical vicissitudes of Russian modernism. An émigré critic deemed Acmeism a sterile doctrine, because its metaphysical dimension was too subdued for the understanding of realism in late modernist culture.[54] Concurrently, liberal Soviet critics tried to salvage the modernist legacy by reading Acmeism as a precursor to Socialist Realism.[55] Stalinist enforcers debunked Acmeism's realist ambitions as a perversion of the Chernyshevskii tradition.[56] After the Second World War, while Soviet critical orthodoxy continued to stress the falsity of modernist claims to realism, an émigré scholar, Vladimir Markov, developed a theory whereby Acmeism had laid the groundwork for Socialist Realism.[57]

Such polysemy and porousness of realism—the term, the concept, and the eponymous nineteenth-century school—make taxonomical recourse to the realist/modernist contrast akin to fishing with dynamite. The anti-realist paradigm forces scholars to take sides in old partisan debates by favoring one of many competing meanings of realism, which originally crystallized as polemical tools in the service of transient literary politics. Despite the enduring appeal of the realist/modernist dichotomy, a glut of evidence informs the growing wariness to this juxtaposition, in Russian modernist stud-

ies, as decontextualized and counterproductive, because it obfuscates and excludes more than it explains.[58]

Russian modernism's rising fortunes after the failed 1905 revolution, which undercut the intelligentsia's value system, erased what classificatory utility the realist/modernist dichotomy had hitherto held. The incipient vogue of "new art" among educated readers convinced the Realist school's epigones to graft modernist diction and topoi onto old mimetic conventions, fueling a rush for critical terminology to pin down this phenomenon: "neo-/new realism," "mystical realism," "realist symbolism," "impressionism."[59] Leonid Andreev summed up the taxonomical disarray: "Who am I? For the blue-bloods of Decadence, I am a vile Realist; for hereditary Realists—a suspicious Symbolist [. . .] Babel-like confusion!"[60] Such inadequacy of the realist/modernist contrast as a tool for charting the literary process begat anxiety among the acolytes of the intelligentsia and modernist aesthetics alike.[61] Marxists were particularly vocal about the typological fluidity of literary life as a symptom of the intelligentsia's betrayal of its sociopolitical mission. This view, elaborated in two essay collections, both called *Literary Disintegration* (1908–9), later became a durable premise of Soviet cultural historiography.[62] But partisan actors in the modernist community also saw a threat to the purity of their cause in the post-1905 erosion of the realist/modernist contrast, manifest in the proliferation of "semi-Symbolists" and "semi-Realists."[63]

Adding insult to injury, the marriage of canonical Realist practices to thematic and stylistic aspects of "new art" was driven by the Russian cultural market's newfound appetite for all things modernist. The "Babel-like confusion" of aesthetic systems grew apace with the mercantile promiscuity of the print media. By the late 1900s, modernists were wooed in the journals run by the same people who had invented the anti-realist paradigm as a critical scourge of "new art." Similarly, "semi-Realists"—many defecting from Gorky's Znanie group, which used to carry high the banner of the Chernyshevskii tradition—now collaborated in modernist periodicals. Commercial publishing ventures, like the *Shipovnik* anthologies, sought to widen their readership by bringing under one editorial roof an array of recent aesthetic and philosophical foes, who promptly succumbed to the promise of high remuneration.[64]

This historical context makes the classification of authors along the realist/modernist lines a sterile exercise. Take Leonid Andreev. As long as "new art" lacked legitimacy, modernists distinguished Andreev from the rest of Gorky's

Znanie group. Deploring Andreev's lack of mystical intuition, manifest in his reliance on the referential illusion and social commentary, they still tabulated him as a kindred spirit on the strength of the writer's Dostoevskian angst and "neurotic" narration.[65] After 1905, Andreev indeed felt one with "new art," publicly heralding his conversion, so that critics took to prefacing his name with modernist, Symbolist, and Decadent tags.[66] Andreev's evolution was convincing enough to fix his status in Soviet historiography as that of a renegade embodying the intelligentsia's decay.[67] Yet "the blue-bloods of Decadence," to use Andreev's own phrase, who had only recently praised his art, began to demur. With modernism thrown into crisis by its sudden public success, Andreev's popularity became a convenient lightning rod for the anxieties besetting the pioneers of "new art."[68] Belyi, hitherto Andreev's attentive reader, regretted "going on record in favor of this writer," presently the epitome of "slapdash Symbolism," which faked mystical intuition and dressed the Realist aesthetic in a vulgarized garb of "new art" for mass consumption.[69]

In his rejoinders, Andreev mocked the realist/modernist contrast as a critical fiction, just as the acolytes of "new art" did when it suited their purposes. Now, however, they deployed the fluid notion of realism to "differentiate" their "aristocratic" art (Ellis) from the writings of "Symbolism's Realist epigones" (Belyi), who rallied to "new art" after 1905, "compromising 'modernism' in the eyes of the almighty mob" (Chudovskii).[70] As long as signal traits of early modernism—grand philosophical and metaphysical abstractions, obscure mystical jargon, lofty and heavily allegorical rhetoric, semantic imprecision—targeted a restricted coterie of readers, they kept their value as markers of genuinely "modern" art. But once the likes of Andreev abandoned the Realist canon, taking the modernist aesthetic to the wider public, marketplace success became a crooked mirror exposing the commonplaces and conceits of "new art," now expediently chalked up to popularizing corruption perpetrated by modernism's epigones.[71]

If we do not invest "realism" with a fixed meaning (inevitably partisan) and heed instead that notion's historical function as a weapon of literary politics, then we can hardly justify the exclusion of Andreev's oeuvre—or of such artistically pedestrian novels about "new men and women" living by the "new sensibility" as Mikhail Artsybashev's *Sanin* (1907) and Anastasiia Verbitskaia's *Kliuchi schast'ia* (*Keys to Happiness*, 1908–13)—from the textual corpus of Russian modernist studies. This traditional exclusion, rationalized and facilitated by the realist/modernist dichotomy, is an outcome of our

failure to rise above the factional fray of the literary process under investigation. It is unclear, for example, to what extent modernist accolades for Sologub's *Melkii bes* (*The Petty Demon*, 1905–7), reflected the novel's qualitative superiority to *Sanin* and *Keys to Happiness*, as opposed to Sologub's high status in the modernist community. A cogent argument could be made that Sologub's novelistic dramatization of modernist philosophical clichés was as vulgarizing as Andreev's and Artsybashev's. Witness their concurrent marketplace success, echoed by that of Verbitskaia's best seller sporting two epigraphs from Nietzsche. Besides, when they did not exploit the realist/modernist contrast to polemical ends, Russian "new artists" acknowledged what unaligned critics like Semën Vengerov, who coined the term "synthetic modernism," claimed all along—namely, that the nonmaterialist understanding of reality and the attendant striving for greater artistic realism often resulted in a hybrid aesthetic that drew on the Realist canon to convey the "new sensibility."[72]

Consider *The Petty Demon*. Today, we read Sologub's satire of Russian provincial mores as a quintessentially modernist text. But this was not always the case. Despite Sologub's later reputation as an "Ur-Decadent" (Gornfel'd), his initial reception in the modernist community was "tepid," because "his Symbolism," like Andreev's, looked "rationalistic, artificial, decorative, and derivative" (Pertsov).[73] *The Petty Demon* was brought out by the omnivorous Shipovnik publishers after being rejected by the modernist Skorpion and the Realist Znanie, which Sologub saw as equally viable editorial options. The novel fused a mystical outlook with the referential illusion, pushing the envelope of factional loyalties. Initially, the modernist community did not read *The Petty Demon* as a break with the Chernyshevskii tradition but hailed it for injecting an "indisputably 'Realist'" work with "Symbolist meaning."[74] *The Petty Demon*'s fictional dramatization of modernist philosophical clichés echoed the Realist approach to art as a vehicle of ideas. In 1928, writing in exile, Dmitrii Mirskii still cast *The Petty Demon* as a rare achievement of "Russian Symbolism" in prose, because the novel, "without apparently departing from the canons of nineteenth-century realism, informed them with a new meaning."[75] A few years later, Stalinist criticism codified the same novel as incarnating "decadent" anti-realism. As a result, the text came to exemplify Russian modernism's alleged anti-realist ethos. Yet it is hard to ignore Mirskii's claim that Sologub's novel followed the Realist school's mimetic conventions, if only because this continuity facilitated the book's post-Stalinist rehabilitation in Soviet literary scholarship.[76]

The Petty Demon was read by its original interpretive community not as a rebuff to the Realist canon but as its adjustment to a different idea of reality.[77] Readers were free to explain supernatural events in the novel by the protagonist's insanity, in which case Sologub garnered praise for revitalizing Realist practices.[78] Or they could attribute these events to the presence of the otherworldly in the everyday. Sologub created such ambiguity, which Tzvetan Todorov identified as the axis of the fantastic in art, by toning down the Realist canon's analytical and narrative omniscience. The ensuing clash of positivism and mysticism appealed to modernists who hailed the novel's "fresh realism," wherein "Symbolism upheld the validity of the Realist school" while removing its materialist blinders (Belyi).[79] This duality solidified *The Petty Demon*'s market success by appealing to two publics, the modernist coterie and educated readers at large, who found the novel accessible and "Decadent" enough to quench their thirst for the "new sensibility."[80] At this time, in fact, fantasy made its way even into the writings of militant Marxists. Witness Aleksandr Bogdanov's gothic science fictions populated by aliens and vampires (*The Red Star* [1908], *Engineer Menni* [1913]). The post-1929 ban on Bogdanov's novels coincided with the proscription of the equally ontologically ambiguous *Petty Demon*, whose fate in the USSR was sealed by the mockery of the radical Left in Sologub's next novel, *Tvorimaia legenda* (*The Created Legend*, 1914), which pushed *The Petty Demon*'s narrative and philosophical premises further, alienating Sologub's former positivist admirers.[81]

The Petty Demon canonized ontological ambiguity in modernist art, stimulating Vengerov's musings about "synthetic modernism." Now, "new art" was all but expected to have two sides: "one—outward and formally accessible, another—hidden, allusive, and intelligible to a select few," explained Belyi, structuring accordingly his novel, *Serebrianyi golub'* (*The Silver Dove*, 1909).[82] Like *The Petty Demon*, Belyi's tale about an intellectual's fatal encounter with peasant sectarians garnered praise for overcoming "Decadence" in Realist referentiality and sociology (Amfiteatrov) and for fusing the mundane with the transcendental—"Realism with Symbolism" (Berdiaev, Kuzmin, Slonim)—in a kind of "aestheticized mystical Populism" (Prishvin) that also marked Aleksei Remizov's literary praxis.[83]

Such hybridity persisted in Russian modernist writing. We find it in the prose of Isaac Babel, Boris Pil'niak, Iurii Olesha, and Vladimir Nabokov, variously dubbed "neorealist/neo-symbolist," "realist-symbolist/realist-romantic," "expressionist," and "synthetic."[84] The last epithet belongs to Evgenii Zamiatin, who altered Vengerov's notion of "synthetic modernism" into that of

"synthetism" (*sintetizm*) to describe the writers of the 1920s who carried on the modernist quest for higher reality, now motivated by Freud's and Einstein's theories, in "aesthetic-philosophical hybrids" that "synthetized the everyday and the fantastic" and combined "the Realist microscope with Symbolism's telescopic lenses trained on infinity."[85] With the notion of realism as fluid as ever, Zamiatin's critical interlocutors in the USSR and in exile could dispute his logic, but they could not fail to recognize its roots in the modernist tradition.[86]

Ultimately, such notions as "synthetism" and "synthetic modernism" cannot remedy the taxonomical inadequacy of the anti-realist paradigm in modernist studies. For, just as some Russian writers drew on Realist practices to express the "new sensibility," others used modernist devices without departing from the materialist outlook of the Realist school. Consider Mikhail Bulgakov—Andreev's stand-in as the bête noire of modernist criticism in the 1920s. Literary historians have been loath to side with Bulgakov's modernist detractors, largely on the strength of *Master i Margarita* (*The Master and Margarita*, 1940), whose reliance on the fantastic (Satan's visit to Stalinist Moscow) and the narrative dramatization of Christ's Passion jarred so much with the Socialist Realist dogma that, upon the novel's belated publication (1967), it became a dissident cult classic in the USSR. At first glance, *The Master and Margarita* indeed continues the tradition of "synthetic modernism." Nevertheless, scholars aligning Bulgakov's novel with major works of Russian modernist prose struggle to justify this rapprochement.

The novel's reflection on the nature of reality and authorship resonates with modernist concerns, but it "lacks the nervous, edgy tenor of much Russian modernist fiction," and its take on these concerns "runs counter to the anxiety and uncertainty of modernity."[87] Bulgakov shares modernism's metaliterary focus: his hero's Christological novel is framed by *The Master and Margarita*'s larger narrative, which, however, alternates so neatly between biblical Jerusalem and Stalinist Moscow as to remove the core principle of modernist metafiction that makes readers into the cocreators of meaning, parsing through narrative planes, times, and voices. Bulgakov's writer-hero embodies the "modernist project, which presumes the existence of other worlds to which poets have privileged access," yet the novel sticks to Tolstoy's mimetic strategies.[88] Bulgakov's turn to the Gospels recalls early modernism, whose mysticism he nonetheless swaps for the rationalism of David Strauss's, Ernest Renan's, and Tolstoy's biblical scholarship. Bulgakov's recourse to the fantastic suggests that his novel belongs to the same literary

series as *The Petty Demon*. But, unlike Sologub, he leaves no room for ambiguity regarding the irruptions of the otherwordly into the everyday: demonic events in Moscow are playful satirical tools modeled on recent Soviet picaresques. Thus, outside the ideological context shaping its reception in late Soviet culture, when *The Master and Margarita* was read in contrast to the Realist canon and its Socialist Realist spinoff, attempts at the novel's typology by the parameters of the realist/modernist dichotomy remain sterile. And the notions of "synthetism" and "synthetic modernism" are of little help here.

The fluidity of the realist/modernist opposition exposes the commonality of premises linking the Realist school to its purported nemesis. Russian Marxists continually decried the hybridity of "new art," chalking it up to modernism's epistemological doubt, ontological ambiguity, and aesthetic eclecticism. Before the Bolshevik coup, the Marxist striving for clarity and stability in matters of critical classification and value judgment generated a binary vision of Russian artistic life, divided into the (realist) friends and (modernist) foes of the proletarian cause. This vision was later canonized in Stalinist historiography and persisted, with minor modifications, in late Soviet scholarly discourse. Modeling the twentieth-century literary process as a war of two neatly defined camps—realist and modernist—Soviet critical dogma obfuscated the historical importance of hybrid poetics in modernist culture, since such poetics eroded the rigid juxtaposition of the alleged aesthetic antipodes.[89]

The hybridity of modernist practices also exposed the Soviet literary canon to contraband, which ranged from attempts to justify Futurism and Acmeism in realist terms to such rehabilitation projects as Zhirmunskii's reading of Blok's play *Roza i krest* (*The Rose and the Cross*, 1913) as a work of "realist symbolism," a chivalric romance denouncing bourgeois decadence.[90] Modernist claims to artistic realism put Marxist critics on the defensive, challenging their understanding of realism's philosophical and aesthetic roots in the positivist tradition.[91] Hence the rhetorical intensity of the anti-realist paradigm in the Soviet critical treatment of modernist culture. The Soviet construction of modernism as the cultural Other enshrined the realist/modernist dichotomy as a major critical device that was then exported into Western critical thought by the likes of Georg Lukács, who, already in 1934, attacked Ernst Bloch and Bertold Brecht on the subject of modernism's ontological ambiguity and quest for higher reality.[92]

It is as a response to such exploitation of the realist/modernist contrast,

discredited in the first three decades of Russian modernist experience but revived in Soviet criticism, that we can better understand Roman Jakobson's 1921 attack on the abuses of the term and concept of realism. Jakobson's critique did double duty at the time when "realism" began its transformation from a fluid weapon of literary politics into an academic dogma propped up by the Marxist use of the anti-realist paradigm as a principle of artistic classification. As a literary scholar, Jakobson set the historical record straight. As a modernist, he debunked the anti-realist critical paradigm, advancing his own understanding of realism—not as a static doctrine but as an open-ended series of evolving mimetic conventions attuned to the changing conception of reality, that is, the way artistic realism had been understood all along in Russian modernist culture.[93]

Today, such awareness of realism's inherent semantic instability as an aesthetic notion invested with functional rather than conceptual significance and vulnerable to partisan abuse will go a long way toward calming down the errant compass rose of modernism's cultural cartography.

Tradition and Innovation as Cardinal Directions

"The modernist," we are told, "has a sense of having made a break with the traditions of the recent past that is more drastic than would have occurred in a continuous process of growth." As a result, "in their creation of forms modernists are radically experimental, whereas in their thinking or values they are radically questioning of accepted orthodoxies."[94] These words encapsulate the innovation paradigm, which is as ubiquitous among the methodological assumptions of modernist studies as it is problematic. Take T. S. Eliot's 1928 self-description as "classicist in literature, royalist in politics, and Anglo-Catholic in religion," which did not strike Ezra Pound as incompatible with his own artistic program of "making it new." Both poets understood "tradition" as a core value of modernist identity whose "consciousness of place in time," in Eliot's words, "compelled a man to write not merely with his own generation in his bones, but with a feeling that the whole of the literature of Europe from Homer and within it the whole of the literature of his own country had a simultaneous existence."[95] Nor do we find support for equating modernism to aesthetic iconoclasm in Arthur Rimbaud's censure of Charles Baudelaire's traditionalism. Decrying the classical poetics of *Les Fleurs du mal*, which jarred with his own prerogative of being "absolutely modern," Rimbaud extolled the book's novel sensibility. This sensibility ensured the status of *Les Fleurs du mal* as a founding text

of modernism—"alien to us in form but our kith and kin in striving and sensibility," as Briusov put it three decades later.[96]

Our conceptualization of modernism in terms of anti-traditionalism is dogged by the same problems as the anti-realist paradigm. There is a gap between the modernist *rhetoric* of novelty and the varied *understanding* of intellectual and artistic innovation by the carriers of that rhetoric and their public. The trope of "the new" is paramount to modernism, whose overarching ideology hinges on innovation in art and life, while its consciousness of time is often expressed in vanguardist metaphors. But the actual perception of specific intellectual and aesthetic practices as radically novel varies a great deal across the national synchrony and historical diachrony of transnational modernist culture.[97]

A painting like Georges Seurat's *La Grande Jatte* (1886) and the visual aesthetic of Russia's turn-of-the-century World of Art group were experienced by their original audiences as no less shocking and experimental than Picasso's Cubist works or Malevich's geometric abstractions.[98] Artistic novelty is in the eye of the beholder, whose judgment is predicated on aesthetic experience specific to a historical moment or national tradition—what Hans Robert Jauss calls the horizon of expectations of cultural consumers and Douwe Fokkema describes as the sociocode of a semiotic community.[99] In 1908, when unaligned critics tried to explain current literary life to the lay Russian reader, they "called modernist all writers who, steeped in [. . .] hatred of old aesthetics and traditional poetics, strove to destroy them, demanding full creative freedom and seeking tirelessly new expressive tools and literary forms."[100] This statement referred to *early modernists* whose writings were experienced by contemporaries in the same way the works of *high modernists*—Futurists, Vorticists, Dadaists, and so on—would be in their time, although the latter claimed to be more innovative than the former.

The price of disregarding historical context is the anachronistic "optical illusion" (Jakobson) that makes students of modernism essentialize the self-description of their research objects, whose rhetoric of experimentalism and originality—mocked back in the day as "chronic vanguardism" (Thibaudet) and "steeplechase for novelty" (Veidle)—was a stock tool of modernist self-legitimation.[101] The innovation paradigm in modernist studies has always rested on a series of unspoken assumptions elevating a scholar's aesthetic or political preferences to the status of objective methodology. Locating an irreducible core of novelty in practices that appeal to them as cultural consumers or ideologues, researchers demarcate select events in modernist

culture and call them "the avant-garde."[102] Yet there is nothing essential about vanguardism and the experimental novelty it denotes: both categories respond to the question, "When?" and are circumstantial by virtue of depending on transient historical contexts, with every artistic trend enjoying its avant-garde moment before becoming part of tradition.

Suffice it to recall that the general critical adoption of vanguardist metaphors—first applied to art by Saint-Simon in order to cast poets as pioneers of social change and then mocked by Baudelaire as a symptom of French militarism—framed the post-1848 rise of the Realist school in visual and verbal arts. These metaphors denoted Realism's aesthetic and ideological novelty prior to performing the same function for Impressionists and Naturalists (1870s); Decadents and Symbolists (1880s); the exponents of Art nouveau, Modern Style, and Jugendstil (1890s); and so forth.[103] Symptomatically, the bane of early Russian modernists, art critic Vladimir Stasov, dismissed their rhetoric of novelty by postulating the enduring vanguardism of the Realist school in painting, from Courbet to the Russian Itinerants.[104]

Since the understanding of artistic tradition and innovation continuously evolves, the notion of the avant-garde is helpful only insofar as it marks that brief moment in the history of aesthetic and intellectual trends, not limited to modernism, when they first emerge and vie for legitimacy.[105] And while modernists of all nations and epochs routinely touted their programs as sharply original, such claims are better understood *functionally*—as a strategy of self-positioning in a field of cultural production that prized innovation as a creative principle ever since the romantic rebellion against the neoclassicist aesthetic. Otherwise, we lose critical distance from our material, absorbing the partisan biases of modernist cliques and "contaminating the epistemological model by the object of research."[106]

For instance, until the rise of the new modernist studies in the 1990s, Anglophone scholars limited their purview of literary modernism to art that self-consciously problematized representation. Viewing innovation as predicated on experimental metareflexivity, they cast the latter as the defining aspect of modernist prose.[107] This assumption reduced half a century of heterogeneous modernist writing to a series including, at most, Andrei Belyi's *Petersburg* (1913), Marcel Proust's *In Search of Lost Time* (1917–27), James Joyce's *Ulysses* (1922), André Gide's *The Counterfeiters* (1925), Virginia Woolf's *To the Lighthouse* (1927), Alfred Döblin's *Berlin Alexanderplatz* (1929), and Vladimir Nabokov's *The Gift* (1937). Such methodology conveyed the vantage point of one, albeit vocal, trend in modernist critical thought—manifest

in Theodor Adorno's *Aesthetic Theory*, Walter Benjamin's "Crisis of the Novel," and Virginia Woolf's "Mr. Bennett and Mrs. Brown"—that promoted a selective *high modernist* canon prizing narrative and linguistic self-reflexivity over referentiality.[108] But rather than analyze this critical thought in the context of contemporary literary politics, Anglo-American modernist studies appropriated its premises, which informed, for several decades, its reductive canon.

Applied to Russian artistic life, this canon excluded many texts whose modernist authors opted not to challenge narrative and stylistic conventions, dramatizing the "new sensibility" in literary fiction by traditional aesthetic means—from the already mentioned novels by Sologub (*The Petty Demon*) and Belyi (*The Silver Dove*) to Merezhkovskii's *Khristos i antikhrist* (*Christ and Antichrist*, 1895–1905), Kuzmin's *Kryl'ia* (*Wings*, 1906), Briusov's *Ognennyi angel* (*The Fiery Angel*, 1907–08), and Z. Gippius's *Chërtova kukla* (The devil's puppet, 1911). The "confining Anglo-American canonization of high modernism" fell similarly short in other cultural contexts; for instance, "most of German and Austrian modernism simply did not fit" into it.[109] In Anglo-American modernist studies this canon has been recently taken to task for marginalizing a number of authors—Ford Madox Ford, Ralph Ellison, Graham Greene, and others—whose prose retained the Realist school's investment in the referential illusion while espousing the vision of modernity characteristic of more openly experimental and self-referential modernist writing.[110]

When it comes to verse, the same tendency selectively to identify some high modernist practices as paradigmatically experimental and innovative—Futurism-Constructivism, Imagism-Vorticism, Dada-Surrealism—has produced a similarly reductive vision of "modernism [as] most readily understood through the work of the avant-garde authors" (Childs), so designated in contrast to the rest of modernist poetry as allegedly less innovative (Greenberg, Wellek).[111] Scholars have absorbed this methodological bias from another trend in modernist critical thought, originating with the Russian Formalists, who elaborated their literary theories in tandem with the partisan promotion of Cubo-Futurist practices, which they invested with exclusive vanguardist value at the expense of rival Russian modernist factions.[112]

A byproduct of this enduring critical tradition, expounded in Peter Bürger's *Theory of the Avant-Garde* (1974), is the concept of the "historical avant-garde" that validates the poetic canon comprising the aforementioned and homologous practices from the 1910s through the 1920s, and chronologi-

cally overlaps with the high modernist canon in prose. Bürger's concept informs, inter alia, the common periodization of Russian "new art" as a bipartite sequence of modernism and the avant-garde, with a divider in 1912–13—the time of the consolidation of the Khlebnikov-Maiakovskii faction, which allied itself with emergent Cubist and abstractionist currents in the visual arts.[113] But despite its "historical" qualifier, Bürger's canon disregards historical facts. All actors in Russian modernist culture, and not just the self-styled Futurists, thought of themselves and were seen by contemporary readers as radical innovators. Differences between their respective poetics were routinely exaggerated in the course of factional polemics and subsequently perpetuated by partisan critics-cum-literary historians.[114]

A momentum has been building against the methodological rationale and ideological motivations of Bürger's theory. Scholars have highlighted its elisions and inaccuracies, disputing the existence of the essential features that, according to Bürger, warrant a contrast between modernism and the avant-garde.[115] This revision is of special importance for students of Russian modernist culture, whose productivity in the 1890s–1900s surpassed that of Anglo-American modernism. Yet early modernism in Russia does not receive its due attention from scholars inured to the narrow high modernist and historical avant-garde canons.[116] The paradigm of innovation dictates a reductive vision of intellectual and aesthetic iconoclasm, putting us in a methodological straightjacket. Witness the travails of a scholar hard pressed to explain the existence of Russian "anti-experimental modernists producing genuinely innovative work" that "might strike Western readers as neo-romantic and even anti-modernist"—provided, of course, we restrict the notion of innovation to a few practices emerging in the third decade of Russian modernist experience.[117]

Historical evidence paints a differentiated picture of the ways in which Russian cultural producers and consumers understood innovation in relation to tradition. Pioneers of Russian "new art" steered clear of the linguistic and prosodic experiments conducted by Stéphane Mallarmé's circle in France. Such ostensible traditionalism sat comfortably with their claims to radical novelty, just as their engagement with premodern cultural legacies—from pagan mythology and classical antiquity to seventeenth- and eighteenth-century art—went hand in hand with modernism's eschatological ethos of renewal.[118] In 1908, Briusov disputed the "definition of 'modernists' as writers who 'loathed old aesthetics and traditional poetics, longing to destroy them.'" In his opinion, this definition "did not suit many poets who qualified

as 'modernists.'"[119] Indeed, pioneers of Russian "new art" did not leave the framework of canonical prosody, which remained important even for Viacheslav Ivanov and Andrei Belyi, whose linguistic, rhythmic, and strophic experiments mediated the intergenerational continuity of the modernist poetic legacy in Russia.[120] Yet these early modernists saw their creative activity in vanguardist terms, experiencing as radically innovative the fin-de-siècle revival of the country's poetic tradition through the rediscovery of its prosodic and emotive potential, grown derelict in the age of the Realist novel.[121]

This rediscovery broadened the ways Russian poetry was written; changed its presentation, dissemination, and consumption; and affected the hierarchy of genres, with prose now taking a back seat to verse.[122] In the 1900s, when new ways of structuring poetic collections and reciting poetry were more important than novel ways of writing verse, self-styled Decadents and Symbolists were treated as "poetic innovators" (Annenskii) whose simultaneous "reverence for literary history" and "quest for the new sensibility [. . .] revolutionized Russian poetry" (Berdiaev).[123] Such an understanding of innovation, centered on the exploration of new topics and the revival of forgotten forms, found validation with the public of early modernism, whose "allusive and oblique verse" turned its readers into active cocreators of meaning and was, by this token, experienced as "an artistic coup d'état" (Zhirmunskii).[124]

In fact, Mandel'shtam's 1923 maxim—"The justification and rehabilitation of the true values of the past are as revolutionary an act as the creation of new values"—applies across the Russian modernist aesthetic spectrum throughout the culture's lifetime.[125] This includes the Cubo-Futurists, whose claim to radical innovation clashed with their reception as archaizing traditionalists—a logical outcome of Cubo-Futurist attention to Old Russian morphology and lexicon, eighteenth-century prosody, and primitive civilizations.[126] The literary legacy of Cubo-Futurists, like that of their early modernist teachers, was eventually dismissed by the next modernist cohort as an obstacle to vanguardist innovation, which, in the 1920s, ran through a "neoclassical" aesthetic that looked more iconoclastic than the trite poetics of the epigones of Futurism.[127] Today's anachronistic acceptance of Cubo-Futurist claims to vanguardism at the expense of other Russian modernist practices reflects a larger methodological bias in modernist studies.

Take Marjorie Perloff's insistence that "such reputedly 'advanced' magazines as the *Egoist*, *Poetry*, and the *Little Review* were publishing, in 1913–14, poems only nominally departing from Edwardian meters and stanza forms,

so [Ezra] Pound [. . .] had to assume an adversary role, not just vis-à-vis the cultural establishment, as was the case with Apollinaire or Marinetti or Mayakovsky, but against what claimed, ironically enough, to be the 'new poetry.' "[128] Perloff essentializes Pound's claim to novelty, dismissing rival modernist claims with no regard for the literary politics of the day and spurning the understanding of vanguardist practices by the modernist coteries of the aforementioned journals. Pound skillfully played the cultural market, branding as radically novel whatever suited his partisan purposes: he demoted the Imagist doctrine from its "adversary role" in favor of the newly minted Vorticism once the logic of literary life required such a maneuver. Besides, pace Perloff, Apollinaire and Maiakovskii defined themselves, like Pound, against old and new modernist rivals—including Marinetti, whom both Russian Futurists and Pound's Vorticists deemed insufficiently innovative, while Marinetti replied in kind—rather than against the fin-de-siècle cultural establishment, delegitimized by their modernist predecessors, the avant-garde of the previous decade.

Russian modernists of all generations distinguished between traditionalism, as a negative quality, and rootedness in artistic and intellectual tradition as a necessary component of innovation—an attitude echoing T. S. Eliot's "consciousness of place in time," cited above. But opinions about the right balance between tradition and innovation always followed literary politics, semantic and evaluative fluidity of the notions of tradition and innovation being part and parcel of Russian intra-modernist debates. To accuse an artist or a group of disguising spiritual sterility and philosophical triviality behind the façade of innovative experimentalism was a critical procedure as frequent as the charge of antiquated traditionalism. No modernist trend escaped such charges. In their polemics with the post-1905 cohort, veterans of "new art" cast its neophytes as barbarians who confused innovation with the destruction of tradition.[129] The latter responded by scorning their elders as traditionalists who missed the true meaning of innovation. But once the urgency of literary politics subsided, Mandel'shtam could publicly admire the balance of tradition and innovation in the poetry of his elder archrival, Blok, who was, in Mandel'shtam's opinion, "surprisingly cautious in matters of style, rhythm, and imagery: not a single open break with the past. Viewing Blok as a literary innovator, one is reminded of an English lord who introduces, with great tact, a new bill in parliament. Blok's conservatism is somewhat of an English rather than Russian kind. It is a literary revolution bound by tradition and faultless loyalty."[130] But in the 1910s, self-styled Ac-

meists and Futurists stripped their teachers, and each other, of vanguardist status, fighting for monopoly of the interpretation of "the new." The Acmeists advanced a program that claimed both to revive a classical aesthetic, purportedly given short shrift in early modernist poetry, and to radicalize that poetry's traditionalist prosody along the lines of Mallarmé's experiments, an intention that remained theoretical. This contradictory agenda, recently dubbed "neoclassical modernism" (Eshelman), makes sense only in its original historical context—against the backdrop of contemporary polemics about the meaning of tradition and innovation, wherein "neoclassicism" could easily become synonymous with iconoclasm. Witness Mandel'shtam's declaration that "classical poetry is the poetry of revolution," or Akhmatova's account of her own tradition-bound poetics as "deafeningly new in 1914."[131]

Victory in this multidirectional intra-modernist debate is anachronistically assigned by literary historians to the Cubo-Futurists, thanks to the lasting influence of Formalist critics-cum-scholars whose aesthetic bias is palpable in Bürger's concept of the "historical avant-garde."[132] The partisan construction of Khlebnikov and Maiakovskii's circle as the quintessence of poetic innovation is at its most apparent in the internal debate pitting Viktor Zhirmunskii, a supporter of the Acmeist claim to "neoclassical" vanguardism, against the majority opinion among his fellow Formalist theoreticians.[133] Incidentally, adherents of the "historical avant-garde" concept conveniently overlook the historical fact that, as the dust of the previous decade's literary politics settled in the 1920s, modernists began to revise their recent assumptions about innovation and tradition.

In 1921, Jakobson observed that Khlebnikov and Maiakovskii had followed the trajectory of all original poets since Pushkin, because the initial shocking novelty of their verse was already giving way to familiarity and accessibility.[134] Two years later, Shklovskii discovered vanguardism in Blok's verse, albeit still berating its style and prosody as "primitive" and "banal." He granted Blok's poetry an innovative quality by virtue of its "daring" and "canon-setting" appropriation of popular genres, such as the Gypsy romance, which aligned Blok, in the critic's opinion, with the Cubo-Futurist aesthetic.[135] Boris Pasternak similarly reevaluated Blok's and Belyi's verse as the "vanguardist, engrossing, and original" source of Futurism, which only "reaffirmed" early modernist poetry "through emulation, but in more radical ways." Another veteran Futurist, Benedikt Livshits, even felt comfortable stating that "novelty was a relative category" and that the Cubo-Futurist

aesthetic was not so different from the rest of Russian modernist poetry.[136] Concurrently, the use of vanguardist rhetoric in the modernist community of early Soviet Russia and Russia Abroad was tempered by newfound skepticism regarding exclusive claims to artistic innovation—a concept reinterpreted in late modernist culture not as a radical break with tradition but as an incremental process cutting across practices, factions, and generations.[137]

Crucially for our *functional* understanding of vanguardist metaphors in the modernist discourse of (self-)legitimation, émigré poets in Paris reclaimed what they saw as the classical tradition of Russian verse, echoing T. S. Eliot's concurrent classicist self-designation, while posturing as the avant-garde that superseded the Futurist-Constructivist and Dadaist-Surrealist models.[138] Vladislav Khodasevich justified this neoclassical turn of late Russian modernism by inscribing it within the long-standing distinction between the positively marked rootedness in tradition and the negatively marked aesthetic traditionalism:

> The spirit of literature is about permanent explosion and permanent renewal. As a result, to preserve literary tradition is to make sure that those explosions have a regular rhythm, that they happen for a reason, and do not ruin the mechanism [producing them]. Thus, literary conservatism has nothing in common with literary reaction. Its goal is not to stop all those little explosions and revolutions propelling literature forward, but rather to preserve the conditions allowing for the continuous, unhindered, and purposeful recurrence of explosions. A literary conservative is a consummate arsonist—a keeper of the flame, rather than its extinguisher.[139]

But since the self-presentation of the exiled modernists and their poetic praxis did not readily fit into the rigid parameters of the tradition-innovation contrast, Russian émigré poetry was deemed aesthetically conservative and excluded from the purview of modernist studies.[140]

Like their poetry, the prose of Russian modernists lays bare the methodological inadequacy of the innovation paradigm. As mentioned above, aesthetic conventionality was proper to early modernist prose. Belyi's *Symphonies* (1902–8) and Remizov's folkloric stylizations (*Posolon'*, 1907) were exceptions confirming the rule. Such indifference to formal experimentalism may have derived from the early modernist vision of true reality, discussed in the previous section, as transcendental but objectively existing in historical (premodern) or mystical realms. In this mind-set, the intuitive exploration or erudite recreation of higher reality constituted the essential

novelty and originality of art, deprioritizing aesthetic iconoclasm. Noticeable changes in prose occurred in the 1910s, echoing the rise of new practices in poetry.[141] At this time, Russian modernism turned to the psyche as the source of reality. Like lexical and prosodic iconoclasm in verse, experiments in prose now became means for conveying the unique relation of individual consciousness to the world and were justified by current advances in psychology, physics, and linguistics. This scientific motivation still informed Evgenii Zamiatin's 1924 manifesto reasserting early modernism's Nietzschean vision of life against the backdrop of Einstein's and Freud's theories, the better to dismiss philosophical positivism and its by-product, the referential illusion in art. Stylistic and narrative experiments, Zamiatin argued, echoed the relativity and irrationality underlying the universe and the individual, thereby encoding modernity's fluidity and uncertainty.[142]

In early modernist culture, however, the very understanding of artistic innovation was different. Briusov's *The Fiery Angel*, for instance, hardly fit the bill of experimental iconoclasm. The novel was conventionally narrated by a knight whose liaison with a witch unfolded against the backdrop of sixteenth-century Germany. Why should a modernist trailblazer write in a subgenre that had left the drawing room for the nursery? Precisely because the historical romance was lowbrow enough to vex the guardians of the Realist canon; marginal enough to pique the reader's curiosity; and hermetic enough, in its esoteric subject matter, to showcase authorial erudition while acting as a repository for stories from Briusov's life. Aesthetic traditionalism hid as much as it revealed here. Written for two audiences, *The Fiery Angel* conventionally narrated one tale for lay readers and another tale visible and comprehensible to the modernist community. In the latter, hermetic, dimension, the sentimental triangle of knight Ruprecht, witch Renata, and count Heinrich mirrored the one linking Briusov to writers Nina Petrovskaia and Belyi—a story no less tormented, violent, and steeped in the occult than Renata's.[143]

Such narrative layering had much potential for generating new texts. Texts that were "lived": the heroes reflected the aesthetically meaningful behavior of the prototypes and informed their subsequent comportment. Or texts that were written: in similarly multilayered *Petersburg*, a terrorist intrigue unfolding against the backdrop of the 1905 revolution concealed a story for the initiated—a mythopoetic retelling of Belyi's affair with the wife of his friend Aleksandr Blok. This programmatic fusion of art and life (*zhiznetvorchestvo*) explains *The Fiery Angel*'s prominence in Russian modern-

ist culture. Yet the novel resists classification by the logic of the tradition-innovation dichotomy. The future author of *Petersburg* lauded *The Fiery Angel*'s freedom from "modernist plumage," as Belyi then called the striving for stylistic and narrative originality among the post-1905 epigones and neophytes of "new art." Belyi located *The Fiery Angel*'s achievement in successfully "telling a story (historical on the outside, occult on the inside) that should not be spoken about." And so did Mikhail Kuzmin, who complimented Briusov for hiding "under an apparent tale a profound and secret one." Both modernist writers vaunted Briusov's novel as a new narrative model.[144]

Kuzmin's own prose followed Briusov's recipe, striking a pose of "deceptive simplicity and seeming accessibility."[145] His novels—especially *Wings*, which framed a teenager's homosexual epiphany as an initiation into modernist values—conveyed the "new sensibility" by conventional aesthetic means and concealed romans à clef in traditionally narrated picaresques and in stylized adaptations of premodern, Byzantine and Russian, models. Kuzmin's interpretive community read these texts as innovative artistic statements. Along with his poetry, they solidified the writer's modernist reputation, allowing contemporary critics and latter-day scholars to discuss him alongside Belyi and Remizov.[146] Yet Kuzmin's prose was so neoclassical—in all senses, since it drew on ancient, early modern, and eighteenth- and nineteenth-century models—that Remizov, avenging his own lukewarm reception in Kuzmin's World of Art milieu, branded his rival a spiritual impostor akin to Leonid Andreev.[147] Modernist factionalism aside, Remizov's prose, inspired by many of the same sources, was dismissed by the detractors of "new art" in the same breath with Kuzmin's writings.[148] Besides, Remizov's overt stylistic and narrative experiments resonated with the target audience of Kuzmin's circle, which sought inspiration in premodern historical loci, skipping over modernity as aesthetically and spiritually sterile—an attitude foreshadowing Russian modernism's neo-primitivist and archaizing turn in the 1910s.[149]

By the third decade of its existence, transitioning between its early and high historical stages, Russian modernist culture rethought the meaning of innovation in style, prosody, narrative, and genre, making overt experimentalism a marker of the "new sensibility." In poetry, this development was limited to the post-1905 cohort, while in prose it was driven by veteran modernists—Belyi, Remizov, and Rozanov. But even with formal iconoclasm as the new norm, Russian modernist prose resists the tradition-innovation

contrast, because ostentatious anti-canonicity grew ubiquitous even among the epigones of the Realist canon, who spruced up their writings with outward signs of trendy experimentalism.[150] The 1920s saw a repetition of the Andreev phenomenon. But if Leonid Andreev's putative crime had been in faking the "new sensibility" in aesthetically Realist narratives, now modernist critics railed against the practice of dressing up the antiquated worldview of the traditional intelligentsia and its Marxist spin-off in the borrowed garb of formal originality.

The innovation paradigm is of no help when it comes to distinguishing the experimentalism of Boris Pil'niak's *Golyi god* (*The Naked Year*, 1922), Isaac Babel's *Konarmiia* (*The Red Cavalry*, 1926), Aleksei Remizov's *Vzvikhrennaia Rus'* (Russia in the whirlwind, 1927), or Iurii Olesha's *Zavist'* (*Envy*, 1927) from the "modernist plumage" of future classics of Socialist Realism, who mimicked modernist experiments without the attendant ethos of temporal, spatial, and psychological subjectivity. Novels of civil war and reconstruction by Dmitrii Furmanov (*Chapaev*, 1923), Aleksandr Serafimovich (*Zheleznyi potok* [*The Iron Flood*], 1924), Aleksandr Fadeev (*Razgrom* [*The Rout*], 1925–26), and Fëdor Gladkov (*Tsement* [*Cement*], 1925) embodied Marxist orthodoxy. Yet they echoed Babel's and Olesha's abridged period and expressionistic tropes; shared in Pil'niak's and Remizov's program of colloquial stylization (*skaz*); and copied Belyi's technique of narrative collage, his neologistic phonetic games, and the poetic rhythm and singsong quality of his prose.[151] Given such ostensible experimental contiguity of texts from the modernist and Stalinist canons, scholars can at least differentiate them by manifest ideological divergences. But how are we to approach liminal authors and artifacts, those excluded from the Stalinist canon yet also marginalized in modernist studies, because their worldviews and sensibility lie outside modernist culture?

Mikhail Bulgakov's writings, once again, encapsulate the taxonomical inadequacy of the critical tools at our disposal. His first novel, *Belaia gvardiia* (*The White Guard*, 1924–25), sported many telltale signs of contemporary modernist prose: narrative fragmentation; phonetic play with onomatopoeias and proper names, inspired by *Petersburg*; disjunctive collage; multiple subjective vantage points, reminiscent of *The Naked Year*; disruptive page graphics, launched by Belyi and Remizov; and the conflation of documentary and fictional material. But all these devices did little to support *The White Guard*'s interpretation of the events described—civil war in Ukraine. The novel manifested what passed at the time for antiquated sensibility. The

vision of the world as fluid and chaotic and the transcendental longing for its tabula rasa renewal were among the subtexts of modernist literary experiments. Bulgakov, in contrast, glorified the stability of the middle-class household and recoiled from the aesthetic and existential revolt against enduring *byt* (everyday life) and the traditional family germane to Russian modernism. *The White Guard* assailed the modernist ethos of radical renewal, depicting its carriers—modeled on recognizable Futurist and Formalist prototypes following the Nordau-inspired semiotics of "decadence"—as agents of the cataclysms Bulgakov's heroes fled behind the cream-colored curtains of their cozy home.[152] Contemporaries pointed out the dissonance between Bulgakov's sensibility and the "popularizing compilation" of modernist devices in his novel.[153] But the writer hardly needed such reminders, judging by his private statements favoring the Realist canon over modernist praxis.[154] *The White Guard*'s publication ceased halfway, because its depiction of anti-Soviet Russians was politically incorrect, but this hardly obviates the taxonomical inadequacy of the tradition-innovation contrast as a tool for positioning the novel and its author vis-à-vis the culture of Russian modernism.

Nor does the innovation paradigm help us recognize texts that belong to modernist culture but are loath to flaunt the outward signs of experimentalism. Iurii Tynianov is a case in point. Like most Formalists, Tynianov saw literary fiction as a corollary of scholarship and criticism.[155] Until recently, however, his historical novels about poets Wilhelm Küchelbecker (*Kiukhlia*, 1925) and Aleksandr Griboedov (*Smert´ vazir-mukhtara* [The death of the vazir-mukhtar], 1928) have not been identified as material for modernist studies.[156] Like Briusov and Kuzmin, Tynianov renewed literary language under the guise of stylizing exotic sources (the speech of Russia's early modern elite). And like them, he targeted two audiences. Ostensibly conventional, his novels hid a system of in-jokes and self-conscious narrative tools for the benefit of those versed in Formalist theories. This dual intent shaped the reception of Tynianov's prose, which was never proscribed by Stalinist ideologues but was read by the initiated as a product of modernist culture.[157] Tynianov's fiction offered an alternative to that of his peers. Drawing on the early modernist tradition of concealment, he opted not to challenge the reader by overt experimentalism. But under the seemingly smooth surface of his novels, one finds generic fluidity, narrative fragmentation, stylistic expressionism, subjective viewpoints, and metaliterariness.[158] All this suggests Tynianov's modernist sensibility. But his prose, like Briusov's and Kuzmin's,

resists description and classification through the contrast of tradition and innovation.

This contrast perpetuates another counterproductive methodological assumption, namely, that the challenge posed by noncanonical practices to cultural consumers is a core aspect of the modernist aesthetic. Scholars using the notions of difficulty and accessibility as taxonomical criteria essentialize them as objective and stable, although this dichotomy relies on anachronistic judgment. Artifacts appear clear or abstruse depending on the experience, or the horizon of expectations, of cultural consumers.[159] True, modernism modified the reader's role from that of a passive consumer of messages in the Realist canon (which prized logic, semantic clarity, narrative coherence, and the stability of linguistic signs) to that of an active cocreator of art's meaning. But just as every innovation eventually becomes part of tradition, the initial challenge of modernist experiments wears out as readers grow accustomed to them. Symbolism's vague allusiveness shocked readers at the turn of the century but grew trite by the late 1900s. The initially shocking prosodic and stylistic program of Cubo-Futurism came to be experienced, within a decade, as more comprehensible than Symbolist poetry.[160] Nor did the seeming accessibility of Briusov's *Fiery Angel* or Kuzmin's *Wings* negatively impact their reception in Russian modernist culture, whose appreciation of prose was not limited to the ostentatious iconoclasm of high modernist practices. Characteristically, once Belyi's *Petersburg* became a source of widespread emulation, it lost its aura of inaccessibility, becoming a foil to the nascent ideal of expressive economy in late Russian modernism.[161]

The frequent invocation of difficulty and accessibility in the modernist critical discourse hardly makes these categories less problematic. Like the notions of innovation and tradition, these are malleable tropes whose meaning and value vary by speaker. Ivanov-Razumnik, for instance, used the category of difficulty favorably to distinguish early modernist art ("inaccessible to the general public") from its post-1905 epigones who vulgarized "Symbolism for the masses"—an argument echoed in Riding and Grave's 1927 defense of modernism in Anglophone poetry.[162] Razumnik thus rationalized the growing popularity of the early modernist aesthetic, which he held dear and tried to prevent its dissolution in the cultural mainstream.[163] Yet the poets he shielded from "the mob" were concurrently reaching out to the broader public, making their poetry more comprehensible in response to new competition in a rapidly expanding modernist culture.[164] Besides, modernist self-stylization in terms of accessibility rarely went undisputed. Ac-

meists blamed their Symbolist elders for hermeticism, but their own program of clarity was dismissed by Futurist rivals as surpassing Symbolism in obscurity.[165] When Cubo-Futurists cast their aesthetic as accessible to the masses, currying favor with Lenin's regime, their self-fashioning as "proletarian" artists was rejected as specious, since their art was not readily accessible.[166]

Even in the Marxist critical discourse, the tropes of difficulty and accessibility did not acquire a fixed meaning until the imposition of Socialist Realism. Launching the first literary journal loyal to Soviet rule, Aleksandr Voronskii saw its goal as cultivating the tastes of the newly educated. Nonetheless, the editor ended up making *Krasnaia nov'* an epicenter of modernism whose inaccessibility to the mass reader did not strike Voronskii as contrary to his stated goal.[167] Nor did Soviet Marxists have a monopoly on the ideal of aesthetic accessibility. Émigré modernists from the *Chisla* circle swore by simplicity as the distinguishing trait of their writings. But the ostensible accessibility of their poetry only added a layer of complexity to the prosodic and stylistic heritage of modernist verse. This accessibility was a calculated effect achieved through the refusal of high modernism's ostentatious experimentalism, whose significant absence was fully comprehensible only to readers privy to modernist practices.[168] Such poetics of allusive concealment should not be confused with the Stalinist agenda of bringing art to the mass reader, which entailed the deliberate dumbing down of the aesthetic level.[169] In the 1930s, the critical discourses of Russian Marxists and modernists overlapped in the promotion of accessibility, yet this rhetoric translated into opposite practices in Soviet Russia and in Russia Abroad.

And if this were not enough to cast doubt on the methodological utility of the notions of difficulty and accessibility, their contrast has been politicized by a current in modernist studies that sees its research object as an elitist reaction to cultural democratization.[170] This vision of modernism as a strategy of exclusion through aesthetic difficulty—reviving the aristocratic bias of premodern cultural hierarchies to counter the homogenizing capitalist market—goes by the shorthand of the "Great Divide," coined in Andreas Huyssen's Frankfurt school–inspired study of modernism as "the kind of discourse which insists on the categorical distinction between high art and mass culture."[171] Although Huyssen points to the discursive—that is, *rhetorical*—nature of the high-low distinction in modernist critical thought, he and other adherents of the Great Divide hypothesis read *literally* the modernist rhetoric of elitism, making it a central element in their "embracing and perdurable definition of modernism."[172]

But if we treat the Great Divide like the already examined contrastive pairs—realism/modernism, tradition/innovation, difficulty/accessibility—as fluid and context-driven tropes from the critical discourse of modernists and their contemporary opponents, then we must examine the *function* rather than the *meaning* of the high-low opposition in modernist self-fashioning. In Russian modernist culture, elitism ran parallel to the embrace of peasant and urban lore and of the artistic genres and modes marked as lowbrow. Belyi insisted that his vision of art followed "not the antinomy of the old and the new, but the antinomy of the high and the low."[173] Yet his novelistic oeuvre was indebted to the suspenseful conspiracy thriller, a popular art form par excellence. Blok railed against the domination of cultural life by the semi-educated philistine.[174] But his poetry appropriated the favorite genres of that mass-cultural consumer—the Gypsy and urban romances. Nabokov cultivated a reputation for cultural snobbery but honed his novelistic skills (*Korol', dama, valet* [*King, Queen, Knave*, 1928], *Kamera obskura* [*Camera Obscura*, 1932], *Otchaianie* [*Despair*, 1934]) on middling melodrama and crime fiction. The Great Divide theory obfuscates such discontinuities in modernist experience. It cannot account for Russian modernism's simultaneous distaste for mercantile cultural democratization and savvy marketing strategies targeting the cultural consumer at large (see chapter 5) or the community's countervailing drives to flee commercial mass culture and to shape the psyche and daily life of the mass consumer in the run-up to "the revolution of the spirit" (see chapter 4).

In recent years, the new modernist studies have taken on the Great Divide theory as historically inaccurate and methodologically counterproductive, because supportive of the traditional canon of Anglo-American modernist studies, which excludes many authors, following the criteria of aesthetic innovation and difficulty.[175] The same premises have relegated to the periphery of Russian modernist studies artists of unequal talent and skill—Andreev, Artsybashev, Bulgakov, Erenburg, Gorky, Verbitskaia, Zaitsev, and so on—whose original reception in the Russian field of cultural production hardly warrants this exclusion.[176] In preserving the status quo, we take sides in a century-old literary politics, accepting the Russian modernist canon as it was set by the community's partisan actors, who identified "new art" with high culture the better to promote their factional agendas and validate their aesthetic preferences at rivals' expense.[177]

For too long, our ability to identify and evaluate modernist texts has been ruled by the partisan logic of the objects of our research—a realization

that has only recently begun to modify the textual corpus of Russian modernist studies.[178] Divorced from specific contexts and interpretive communities, the notion of formal innovation falls short as a classification criterion. In fact, the innovation paradigm and its by-products—the difficulty-accessibility contrast and the Great Divide theory—place modernist studies in a methodological straitjacket as reductive, simplistic, and ideologically biased as the realist/modernist dichotomy. Historically, Russians have read as modernist aesthetically traditional fictions that expressed the "new sensibility." Obversely, texts bearing the outward signs of experimental "new art" have been treated as non- or anti-modernist if they displayed ethics and philosophy understood by contemporary Russian readers as traditionalist. The assumptions informing the innovation paradigm in literary scholarship actually obscure the relation of individual artifacts to Russian modernist culture, whose academic explorers would do better to beware of the stock tools for orientation in the modernist terrain.

These tools have equipped us with maps whose errant cardinal directions can fool the most experienced of travelers. Consider Jürgen Habermas's claim that the modernist rhetoric of novelty expresses artists' self-conceptualization vis-à-vis their time (modernity).[179] This statement cannot withstand the test of historical evidence. Thanks to the *evolving* and *varied* understanding of originality and innovation in Russian modernism—and, as Jeffrey Perl has recently argued, in transnational modernist culture—it has been possible for the carriers of the modernist consciousness of time to imagine themselves in the sociopolitical and artistic vanguard without engaging in radical formal experimentation. Furthermore, there were moments in Russian modernist culture—in the late 1900s and then again in the interwar period—when some of its prominent actors distanced themselves from the rhetoric of novelty, whose inflationary overuse had generated the countervailing positive revaluation of traditions codified as "classical."[180]

The epiphany of the dean of modernist studies, Irving Howe, who momentarily allowed for the possibility of literary texts wherein "formal experiment was virtually absent yet the spirit of modernism was extremely powerful," suggests that even a brief journey into Russian modernism might yield a powerful antidote to the static assumptions implicit in the contrastive pair of tradition and innovation and, by logical extension, in the points of cardinal directions they have denoted in our cartography of modernist culture.[181]

3 Russian Modernism in Time and Space

Our vision of Russian modernism's temporal and spatial outlines has been shaped by two historiographic premises. The first posits the year 1917 as the Rubicon demarcating a hypothetical cultural disruption brought about by the Bolshevik takeover. Second, scholars tend to describe interwar Russian cultural life as a parallel existence of mutually isolated Soviet and émigré subsystems, imagining the USSR in the 1920s as more amenable to the modernist sensibility than Russia Abroad. These premises of cultural historiography have gone largely unchallenged, rendering unusable our temporal and spatial charts of Russian modernism. To do justice to the full story of that culture, we need to redraw its outlines in time and space—a task requiring a collective effort that can be fleshed out only in very general terms within the confines of this chapter.

To begin, we need to examine the motives of those who codified and perpetuated the dominant versions of Russian modernist chronology and geography. As I argue below, this cultural cartography was created by our own research objects to partisan ends, much like our field's terminology and taxonomy (see chapters 1 and 2). We also need to identify continuities between the historical stages of Russian modernist culture, despite the chronological and geopolitical fault lines of the Russian twentieth century. The historicity of these fault lines is undeniable, but their stock reading should be contested if we are to overcome obsolete methodological premises. Among other things, such a temporal and spatial remapping of Russian modernism will entail the integration of unduly separated academic fields—modernist and exilic studies—in a single domain of scholarly inquiry.

The Myth of 1917

The casting of the Bolshevik takeover as an epochal event transforming every sphere of life was an existential prerogative of Lenin's regime, which legitimized its coup d'état as a teleological outcome of the entire course of world history. To the ideologues of the October Revolution, the party-state was not just a political project but a Promethean effort aimed at humankind's rebirth. Rehashing the Marxist treatment of time in the thinly veiled terms of Christian eschatology, the triumphant Bolsheviks partitioned history into old and new eras, with the "anno Domini" divider in 1917. This meant that the messianic dictatorship of the proletariat, guided by the party, wiped the slate clean in all aspects of life. Such tabula rasa logic of a new beginning was not limited to Marxist rhetoric. "The 'clean break' hypothesis" (Kelly) was instrumental for the articulation of anti-Soviet positions. It helped frame the Bolshevik rule as alien to Russian cultural traditions, facilitating alternative historical narratives reliant on the same, 1917-centered, temporal template (e.g., the Silver Age).[1] Besides, the rhetoric of a clean break with the past resonated powerfully with eschatological aspirations and the concomitant cult of novelty in Russian modernist culture, helping its actors find common ground with Lenin's regime.

In the 1920s, however, Marxist critics often rued Soviet Russia's modernist scene: "You expect something extraordinarily new. Instead, our tumultuous literary epoch does not differ from the preceding ones [. . .] It is alien to the revolution."[2] The regime's advocates struggled to explain glaring discrepancies between their ideological fictions and the facts of cultural life. The urgent nature of this dissonance for the state's self-legitimation project was manifest in the mass expulsions abroad of intellectuals in 1922–23, accompanied by toughening censorship and political assaults on modernist culture.[3] But all this failed to address the empirical weakness of the clean-break narrative. Lev Trotsky and Aleksandr Voronskii theorized a causal link between the socioeconomic disruption of 1917 and its hypothetical cultural corollary, dividing contemporary writers into "pre-October" and "post-October." As a propaganda tool, this taxonomy worked with reference to the first group, which included, among others, modernist artists. But the second group was much harder to populate with examples. Writing in 1923–24, both critics could not sweep under the rug "the dependence of today's writers on the poetry and prose of the last fifteen to twenty years, a period of reaction and decadence" (Voronskii). Such continuity represented a politi-

cal challenge. Artists, argued Trotsky, willfully "pretended that nothing had happened" in Russia.[4]

Made seven years after the Bolshevik coup, this argument looked all the more tenuous because a plethora of self-styled "proletarian" writers were then claiming to represent "post-October" literature, but their poetry and prose were too epigonic to embody the fabled clean break with the cultural past. Yet Trotsky's and Voronskii's reasoning became standard among those who wanted "revolutionary modernity" to engender qualitatively novel art.[5] Valerii Briusov thus flaunted his newfound Communist credentials by arguing that the Bolshevik dictatorship had given birth to a "separate period in Russian poetry." Unable to support his claim with examples, he fell back on accusatory rhetoric, hypocritically faulting "the overwhelming majority" of poets for remaining "amazingly foreign to [Soviet] modernity."[6] And while promoters of the cultural tabula rasa hypothesis struggled to reconcile theory with facts on the ground, the foes of Soviet rule stressed the persistence of prerevolutionary artistic practices as a way of mocking the regime's modernist allies as opportunistic impostors.[7]

The fortunes of the myth of 1917 improved with the onset of Stalinism, which sensitized authors in the USSR to the consequences of disputing the state's discourse of self-legitimation. The point was forcefully made at the First Congress of Soviet Writers (1934), where Karl Radek castigated "aesthetes" who doubted that the October Revolution had changed the course of Russian and world literature. Three years later, Radek served as a living proof of the hazards inherent in such doubt. During his show trial, the "Trotskyite Fascist" was accused, inter alia, of denying the "obvious fact" that "our Revolution, which had shaken the world, had also shaken world literature."[8] Although the clean-break theory now became a pillar of Socialist Realism, the aporia of the myth of 1917 still had to be dealt with through the systematic rewriting of Russian literary history. The result was a narrative about the lonely genius Maxim Gorky who, amid a "decadent" bacchanalia, had forged the Socialist Realist aesthetic in the 1900s and carried high its banner, with help from Vladimir Maiakovskii and Aleksandr Serafimovich, until the nascent Marxist state gave Socialist Realism an institutional base and more converts, facilitating its ultimate victory over "bourgeois" art.[9] This fantastic schema was reinforced in public anti-modernist campaigns. As late as 1946, Andrei Zhdanov lambasted Anna Akhmatova and Mikhail Zoshchenko as relics of "decadent bourgeois culture which had been ended by the Great October Socialist Revolution."[10] Such temporal logic continu-

ously informed post-Stalinist Soviet scholarship until the ideological relaxation of the perestroika years made room for renewed doubt about the clean-break hypothesis.[11]

On the other side of the geopolitical divide, the rise of Stalinism forced émigrés to reevaluate the idea of the cultural clean break. Having initially denied discontinuity between pre- and post-1917 artistic practices, the better to debunk Bolshevik self-legitimation efforts, émigré opinion shifted in the late 1920s. Now exiled littérateurs acceded to Soviet claims about the clean break with the cultural past, marking it negatively in contrast to the émigré ethos of continuity.[12] Perfected in the concept of the Silver Age, the émigré version of the myth of 1917 exercised considerable influence on Russian studies in the West. If, in 1962, Hugh McLean insisted that "the Revolution of 1917 at first had brought no fundamental changes to Russian literature," the same issue of *Slavic Review* also featured a more common line of reasoning. Arguing that the development of Russian verse and prose had been "arrested" and "the tradition broken off" after 1917, Rufus Mathewson glossed over the two decades of interwar modernist culture, whose manifestations in early Soviet Russia the literary historian saw as exceptions confirming the rule, while showing no awareness of émigré artistic life.[13] Becoming a university discipline in the Cold War environment, Russian studies in the West took at face value the clean-break hypothesis, all the more so because its reworking by émigrés, who were active in the training of Russianists, reversed the Marxist value hierarchy, marking positively the pre-1917 period in contrast to its Soviet sequel. Inured to the myth of 1917, Western students of Russian modernism adjusted their chronology to "the Bolshevik Revolution as the central event of modern times."[14] By such logic, the period from the 1890s to 1917, dubbed the Silver Age, became the lasting focus of Russian modernist studies in the West.

A countervailing trend in Western scholarship, designating the early 1930s as the temporal limit of Russian modernist culture, began to shape up in the 1970s.[15] By the mid-1980s, it became possible to argue that, while "the October Revolution transformed the outward structure of literary and artistic life [. . .] cultural ideas from before the Revolution continued to flourish well into the 1920s."[16] This schema, still eliding the émigré cultural subsystem, raised Russian modernism's upper bracket to the imposition of Socialist Realism. A concurrent Francophone project went further, proposing an inclusive approach to Russian modernism. It brought together the culture's prerevolutionary, Soviet, and émigré iterations to explore the spatial

and temporal continuity, as well as the heterogeneity of Russian modernist experience. In a sign of the times, the project's political motivation—a historiographic alternative to the Soviet praxis—contradicted its methodology: defying the reductive premises of the Silver Age concept, the volume's editors flaunted this anti-Soviet term in the book's title.[17]

In the 1990s, with the collapse of many assumptions perpetuated by the ideological needs of the defunct Soviet regime and its opponents, challenges to the clean-break hypothesis gathered steam. Now one could argue that, while the Bolshevik takeover mattered as the source of structural changes in Russian cultural life, including its split into Soviet and émigré subsystems, the year 1917 marked neither "some sort of big bang in cultural history" (Clark) nor "a very important demarcation line in literary theoretical terms" (Bristol). Many institutional changes in the Russian field of cultural production were now traced to the First World War—so much so that some scholars tried to imagine "a [Russian cultural] history without the revolution" (Cohen).[18] This revisionism also entailed a newfound awareness of historical continuities between modernist and Marxist cultures, whereby the latter not only strove to suppress the former but also drew on the modernist legacy in the course of constructing its own aesthetic.[19] True, by the force of academic inertia, efforts to decenter the year 1917 in Russian cultural historiography have remained a minority position. But they have generated a number of alternative modernist chronologies, discussed later in this chapter.

Culture and Border Patrol

Another methodological premise hitherto central to the temporal and spatial conceptualization of Russian modernist culture denies its continuity in Russia Abroad, imagined as a bastion of aesthetic and intellectual reaction, insulated from Soviet and European art and thought. With a few exceptions—like Aleksei Remizov, Marina Tsvetaeva, or Vladimir Nabokov, so goes the argument—the Russian emigration offered no alternative space for the modernist sensibility and practices extinguished in the USSR.[20] This cultural border patrol has been a major stumbling block in our search for a fuller story of Russian modernism.

Like the myth of 1917, the thesis of aesthetic and intellectual discontinuity between Soviet Russia and Russia Abroad originated in the Bolshevik discourse of self-legitimation, eventually becoming axiomatic on both sides of the geopolitical split. Until the second half of the 1920s, however, there was no general causal link between a Russian writer's place of residence and

her politics or aesthetics. It took the exiles a decade to articulate distinctly *émigré* identities.[21] In the early 1920s, cross-border travel was common, and the motivations of expatriates, many still publishing at home, were too diverse to be reduced to politics. In 1931, émigré critic Mark Slonim mused nostalgically about this time, when the free flow of people, texts, and ideas made the Russian cultural sphere a "system of communicating vessels" with a pan-European geography.[22] The economically induced shift of the center of Russia Abroad from Berlin to Paris, in 1924–25, accelerated the formation of properly émigré identities, which hinged on the choice between repatriation and indefinite exile. The implications of this choice were highlighted by rising Soviet barriers to printed matter from abroad and the growing reluctance of Soviet publishers to collaborate with expatriates—what Dmitrii Mirskii described, in 1927, as the Bolshevik effort to draw "a hard and fast line between the two sections" of Russian literature.[23]

Il'ia Erenburg, a pro-Bolshevik modernist who remained abroad after 1925, learned the hard way the implications of this rift. Waging a polemical war on émigrés, Erenburg was nonplussed to see his books barred from the USSR. "I need not explain to you that Erenburg is not an émigré," he pleaded with Nikolai Bukharin from Paris. "A place of residence, I hope, does not define convictions."[24] As a matter of fact, it did just that for a regime that understood cultural life in terms of ideological warfare and saw a writer's repatriation as political vindication.[25] Symptomatically, the geopolitical polarization of Russian cultural life coincided with a spike in ideological pressure on modernists, whose publishing venues in the USSR crumbled under toughening censorship. Witness the short lives of the journals *Sovremennaia literatura* (1925), which died after its first issue, and *Russkii sovremennik* (1924), which brought together Russia-based and exiled modernists but was shuttered after the fourth issue.[26]

The Bolshevik rationale for erecting a geopolitical wall in the field of cultural production came from the regime's agenda of self-legitimation, whose propagandistic fictions were vulnerable in the face of contrary opinions. Recent émigrés themselves, Bolsheviks were torn between conflicting impulses. Expelling many intellectuals, they also feared the uncontrolled Russian cultural space they helped create abroad.[27] Furthermore, if the Marxist state could disguise its lack of popular support in such simulacra of broad representation as state-run trade unions and local councils, Bolshevik leaders, reared in the intelligentsia cult of literature as the exalted repository of cultural values, had a hard time explaining the mass expatriation of the

keepers of Russian literary traditions. The cultural big bang theory purveyed by the myth of 1917 tackled the problem by postulating the birth of another literature, which made irrelevant the exodus of writers. The resultant "two Russian literatures" hypothesis opposed "old"/"dying" émigré art to "young"/"thriving" Soviet art.

Starting in 1921, the first Soviet literary review, *Krasnaia nov'*—created in response to the launch of *Sovremennye zapiski* in Paris—obsessively asserted the superiority of Soviet Russian literature to its exiled rival.[28] The editor, Voronskii, was uneasy about potential responses from abroad to his empirically tenuous insistence on the birth of a new literature in the annus mirabilis 1917. In 1923, he wondered aloud, "What would the émigrés say about this?" Two years later, the task of debunking émigré claims that "there was no such thing as Soviet literature" remained urgent for Voronskii. As late as 1927, another Marxist critic was equally disturbed by the dismissal of the "border between émigré and Soviet letters as a Bolshevik myth" in the Parisian modernist journal *Versty*.[29]

Soviet loyalists aside, most expatriates initially pooh-poohed Russian literature's alleged division. They took particular exception to Marxist insistence on direct causality between politics and art, finding risible the Bolshevik claim that exile doomed artists to aesthetic and spiritual decline. In Russia Abroad, the latter rhetorical trope resonated only with the traditional Populist intelligentsia, whose mystical view of art as nurtured by national soil fit the Soviet narrative about the ossification of émigré cultural creativity.[30] In 1925-26, the future defector to the Communist cause Dmitrii Mirskii still placed the phrase "Soviet literature" in scare quotes to signal the concept's dubiousness.[31] As late as 1927, even the most ideologically anti-Soviet exiles spoke about division of labor (Gippius) in a Russian literature that had, under political duress, evolved into a system of communicating vessels (Fondaminskii) wherein émigrés compensated for the unfreedom of the "Soviet-controlled" (*podsovetskaia*), rather than "Soviet," wing of the single Russian literary process.[32]

The émigré-Soviet polarization deepened with the onset of Stalinism, which bolstered the policing of the cultural border through heightened restrictions on travel and pressure on writers to stop publishing abroad without authorization. In a sign of the times, a translation of *Don Quixote* (1929) did not indicate the translators' names because the project, begun in 1923, involved an émigré, Grigorii Lozinskii.[33] In the early 1930s, interaction between émigrés and Russians traveling abroad became dangerous for the lat-

ter. In 1938, Georgii Adamovich recalled with incredulity the time when littérateurs from both sides of the geopolitical divide could engage in "frank conversations."[34] But while the cultural border was erected through Bolshevik efforts, both émigré and Soviet subsystems used each other as foils in the process of articulating their respective values. Expressions of mutual attention testify to important continuities in the interwar Russian field of cultural production.

Voronskii was not the only Marxist promoter of the "two Russian literatures" hypothesis constantly looking over his shoulder at Russia Abroad. Until the mid-1930s, the architects of Soviet cultural policies manifested a keen awareness of the existence of the uncontrolled Russian cultural space.[35] Early Soviet periodicals showed sustained attention to it. In 1921–24, major reviews (*Krasnaia nov'*, *Pechat' i revoliutsiia*), journals of militant Marxists (*Na postu*) and pro-Soviet modernists (*LEF*), and nonpartisan literary magazines (*Letopis' doma literatorov*) kept the reader informed—through surveys, bibliographies, and polemics—about Russian art and thought in the West. While the tendency to dismiss Russia Abroad as culturally sterile became pronounced in 1923, the balance of factual reportage and propaganda tipped in favor of the latter in mid-1924, when *Krasnaia nov'* published an essay setting the tone for future discussions of émigré literature.[36] The second half of the 1920s saw a steady stream of similar journalistic pronouncements contrasting robust Soviet literature to its dying émigré foil. Unwittingly, this polemical coverage revealed the insecurity of burgeoning Soviet identity, while keeping readers in the USSR informed about the literary and intellectual life of Russia Abroad.[37]

Before vanishing from public view, signs of anxiety about Russia Abroad multiplied during the Stalinist reform in the Soviet subsystem of the Russian field of cultural production. The elaboration of the Socialist Realist doctrine was punctuated by negative references to the émigré literary process.[38] The consolidation of the Russian modernist milieu in Paris was of particular concern, since the intensity of its creative activity belied the idea of moribund émigré art. In 1932, Leopol'd Averbakh illustrated the axiomatic "decline and decay" of émigré literature "with a plethora of examples from White émigré poetry (Gippius, Smolenskii, Georgii Ivanov, Adamovich, etc.)," going down the list of *Chisla* associates.[39] In response, exiles mocked such Soviet detractors as contrabandists smuggling émigré art under the pretext of polemical citation. At times, smuggling was literal, as when Il'ia Erenburg and

Lev Nikulin, who berated Russia Abroad in the Soviet press, shared with friends in the USSR samples of émigré writings.[40]

Soviet polemicists singled out modernist practices in émigré literary life in the context of their eradication in the USSR, where vestigial modernism was seen as inimical both to Socialist Realism and to Soviet-émigré differentiation.[41] Such association of modernism with emigration was on display in Ol'ga Forsh's *Simvolisty* (Symbolists, 1933; later renamed *Voron* [The raven])—a novelistic act of contrition by a veteran of Russian modernist culture, privy to its life in exile. Forsh's heroine, an upright Komsomol member, travels abroad and tours émigré modernist circles in Berlin and Paris, bringing home the memoirs of her relative, which are then discussed at a Komsomol gathering to the didactic end of contrasting the healthy and truly modern Soviet worldview to the intellectual and ethical obsolescence of émigrés, whose "decadent" sensibility rightly belongs in the "bourgeois" West.[42]

We find a mirror image of this logic in Russia Abroad, where modernism's Soviet vicissitudes were read as a bellwether of Bolshevik cultural policies. There was, in fact, a strong causal link between the birth of properly émigré identity, the Stalinist suppression of modernism back home, and the rise of Paris as the center of Russian modernist culture. What united these events in a causal nexus was the centrality of younger exiles, those maturing artistically and intellectually abroad, in the concurrent processes of émigré identity formation and the consolidation of the Russian modernist community abroad—along the Paris-Berlin-Prague axis—in direct contact with transnational modernist culture.

The emergence of émigré subjectivity entailed a reappraisal of the hitherto spurned "two Russian literatures" hypothesis. Younger authors defied the expatriate consensus, insisting that artifacts coming out of Russia indeed belonged to another, Soviet literature. Émigré writers' mission, they argued, was not just to preserve Russian literary traditions but to develop them further. Impossible in Moscow, this task was feasible in the new capital of Russian letters, Paris, which offered creative freedom and exposure to European art and thought.[43] This polemical appropriation of the Bolshevik "two literatures" hypothesis sparked a critical firestorm in Russia Abroad in the late 1920s.[44] It is not hard to gauge the narrative's appeal to younger exiles, insecure in their artistic identities. Casting Soviet art as sterile and moribund, they turned the tables on the Marxist redaction of the "two literatures" hypothesis, the better to valorize their own status as émigré authors.[45]

Hence their construction of exile as a mission to safeguard and enrich the true values of Russian literature, eradicated in the USSR.[46] So expedient was this version of the "two literatures" narrative for burgeoning émigré subjectivity that, with the onset of Stalinism, it went mainstream in Russia Abroad, accepted by its staunchest former critics.[47]

The epicenter of this intellectual trend was in the Parisian modernist milieu. Consider Georgii Adamovich's evolution. In the 1920s, while castigating Soviet loyalists, because "true art was incompatible with Muscovite communism," Adamovich saw "all of our truly modern art [as] émigré in spirit, even if many of its creators lived in Moscow or Petersburg, held Soviet passports, and neither wanted to leave nor wished for political changes." Treating modernist writing as the only genuine verbal art created in the USSR, the critic spoke of a cross-border continuum: "I see *all* modern Russian art as 'counter-revolutionary' or, more precisely, anti-Marxist."[48] Adamovich's stance lasted into 1928, when he still dismissed the qualifiers Soviet and émigré as silly "passport nicknames."[49] A year later, he already wrote about a "mission of our literature" in contrast to "Moscow's command-driven literature" with "its soulless, dumb, and primitive understanding of art." This change of heart came with Adamovich's realization that modernist practices had been "muffled" in the USSR.[50] From that point on, the critic proclaimed art in the Soviet Union as good as dead, "reserving full and unconditional respect" for a few modernists—Babel, Kaverin, Olesha, Pasternak, Vaginov—"even if they were less and less published," since "genuine literature [in the USSR] was retreating into the new catacombs."[51]

In this "us versus them" schema, Soviet literature was beyond the pale of genuine art. But so were many émigré authors by virtue of their aloofness from the modernist sensibility that, in Adamovich's opinion, put its Russian carriers in the same camp as Virginia Woolf, James Joyce, Marcel Proust, and André Gide.[52] Another veteran modernist, Ivanov-Razumnik, who had previously applied the catacombs metaphor to the modernist community in Soviet Russia (1924), borrowing it from Blok's 1919 essay "The Collapse of Humanism," echoed Adamovich upon finding himself in exile. Dismissing the "great wall of China" erected by Bolshevism in the cultural sphere, Ivanov-Razumnik drew the fault line in Russian literature not between Soviet and émigré but rather between Soviet and European writers, with the latter category including émigrés and some (mostly modernist) artists residing in the USSR.[53]

Émigré interpretations of Russian cultural geography were driven by ar-

tistic concerns as much as by politics. If for Soviet Marxists the geopolitical border between the USSR and Russia Abroad implied cultural confrontation, the émigré opinion was more varied. Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, in whom the modernist sensibility coexisted with aesthetic conservatism, traced the purported death of literature in the USSR to the country's political system. Pavel Miliukov, another anti-Soviet artistic traditionalist but a philosophical positivist, hailed the revival of the Realist canon in the Stalinist aesthetic as a sign of Soviet literary flowering that held dire implications for émigré art, mired as it was in modernist practices. *Chisla* authors voiced yet another position, insisting on the continuity of Russian modernism in exile and at home and on its appurtenance to transnational modernist culture. They reserved the label Soviet for Socialist Realist writing, to which they also assimilated, aesthetically if not ideologically, premodernist practices common among émigré authors.[54] Mocking Soviet art as infantile and provincial, the exiled representatives of the last Russian modernist generation styled themselves in contrast to the narrow intellectual and aesthetic horizons of the first cohort of truly Soviet writers, who matured during the Stalinist Cultural Revolution and found a natural fit in Socialist Realism.[55]

For all intents and purposes, the stock assumption about the self-isolation of Russia Abroad turns history on its head. It was the Soviet subsystem that sealed itself off from the larger Russian and European fields of cultural production, which continued to harbor vibrant modernist cultures. Émigrés retained full access to Soviet publications and monitored literary life in the USSR. Witness, in contrast, Evgenii Zamiatin's tardy discovery of Nabokov after his emigration in 1931, or Ivanov-Razumnik's unfamiliarity with émigré art, due to his belated expatriation in the 1940s.[56] But even the Soviet geopolitical firewall was not impervious. It is possible to argue that émigré modernists found an attentive audience in the "new catacombs" to which some of their colleagues in Russia had been driven by the Stalinist crackdown. Since information about émigré art and thought reached those catacombs by private channels, an adequate account of this aspect of late Russian modernism remains to be written.

Returning travelers brought to the USSR news of Russia Abroad. Émigré books and journals were hot items in Moscow and Leningrad. But we learn about this mostly from police files, while successful contraband was passed along in silence and its impact on the literary process in the Soviet Union is a matter of speculation.[57] We know, for instance, that Lidiia Ginzburg read, in 1927, Tsvetaeva's *Poema kontsa* (*Poem of the End*, Prague, 1924), and in the

late 1930s, Ginzburg privately elaborated a vision of early Russian modernism in dialogue with Khodasevich's reflections on the same topic (Paris, 1924–28).[58] In 1944, Kornei Chukovskii recorded his impressions from reading Georgii Ivanov's pseudo-memoir *Peterburgskie zimy* (*Petersburg Winters*, Paris, 1928).[59] Since Chukovskii and Ginzburg socialized with Akhmatova, it is hardly surprising that the poet was informed about the émigré reception of her works; read émigré poetry and prose, contrasting their styles to her own; and incorporated into her *Poema bez geroia* (*Poem without a Hero*, begun in 1940) allusions to émigré literary life, including Nikolai Otsup's reflections on early modernism in *Chisla*, whence Akhmatova likely borrowed the term Silver Age.[60]

Bridging modernist and exilic studies, however, has been an uphill battle. Soviet cultural historiography obfuscated the subjects of emigration and modernism, whereas émigré scholars responded by stressing the anti-Soviet significance of creative activity in exile at the expense of aesthetic matters. Nor did Western scholars rise above the political fray, accepting as their historiographic model the "two literatures" narrative with all its biases and elisions. As a result, until recently no meaningful effort has been made to account for Russian modernism abroad.

Gleb Struve's 1962 exchange with Hugh McLean encapsulates the issue in Western scholarship. Criticizing McLean's survey "The Development of Modern Russian Literature" for its "disregard of Russian literature outside Russia," Struve—a veteran of Russia Abroad and its pioneer historian—cast this omission as "the greatest lacuna" in his colleague's otherwise bold sketch that defied the myth of 1917. To make his point, Struve invoked the period of émigré letters dominated by modernist practices that ensured "the artistic superiority of much of émigré literature to the literature produced in Russia after 1930." Struve called particular attention to "the younger émigré writers who profited by cross-fertilization from the West," thus positing émigré modernism as a key element in a more inclusive vision of the interwar Russian field of cultural production. McLean's rejoinder showed unfamiliarity with Russian art in exile. Writing that émigré literature "contained no notably new developments" and "could not much affect the evolution of Russian literature," the scholar resorted to the axiom of émigré cultural conservatism, which spared him the trouble of exploring émigré writing. With the exception of Nabokov, argued McLean, émigré literary production "may have been aesthetically valuable, but [. . .] historically unimportant"—a methodological premise that shaped the chronology of Russian modernism

in Western scholarship against the backdrop of enforced Soviet silence about Russia Abroad.[61]

In his 1976 contribution to a transnational modernist history, Donald Fanger echoed McLean's argument. Dating "the 'Modernist' period in Russia [. . .] from the early 1890s to about 1930," he both defied the myth of 1917 and elided the subject of Russia Abroad, again with Nabokov as the sole exception.[62] Russian exilic and modernist studies developed apace, but, despite the growing body of Western scholarship devoted to émigré writers, modernists included, the two fields rarely overlapped. In 1985, an entry on modernism in the encyclopedic *Handbook of Russian Literature* repeated McLean's and Fanger's chronology, keeping mum about émigré art.[63] The methodological consensus remained unchallenged until 1988, when the aforementioned Francophone project proposed an alternative view, treating Soviet and émigré literatures as equally important parts of a whole, and countering the axiom of émigré artistic conservatism in the vision of a "cultural life in exile that was as rich in innovation as early Soviet literature." However, the authors' overriding intention to break political taboos willy-nilly laid stress on the anti-Soviet implications of exile at the expense of aesthetic matters. Hence the volume's haphazard coverage of émigré literature, in contrast to a systematic and nuanced treatment of Soviet literary life.[64]

The status quo in Western scholarship broke down only in the 1990s, in response to the discovery of the émigré heritage in the USSR's waning years and in post-Soviet Russia. This evolution is visible in Victor Terras's budding awareness of another Russian literature in the period he still called "Soviet," thus casting émigré authors as a footnote in the Russian field of cultural production. It is instructive to observe the veteran Russianist's struggle to fit unfamiliar émigré material into his traditional literary-historical schema.[65] In 1998, David Bethea directed attention to the "shadow life of Russian *émigré* literature." A student of Khodasevich's poetry, Bethea urged the readers of *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Russian Culture* to bear in mind that "otherwise reliable accounts of modern Russian literature have often glossed over or ignored as irrelevant" the cultural life of Russia Abroad, whose most important aspect he located in the literary corpus of émigré modernism.[66] The following year, Catriona Kelly made a similar case for including émigrés in the study of modernism, adjusting accordingly the upper limit of her *Utopias: Russian Modernist Texts, 1905–1940*.[67] From then on, it took scholars a decade—a jiffy in terms of academic inertia—to propose alternatives to old methodological assumptions.

If today we finally speak about an interwar Russian cultural continuum made up of émigré and Soviet subsystems, their mutual impact remains a "vastly under-researched area."[68] Besides, old habits die hard. Take *The Cambridge Companion to the Classic Russian Novel* (1998), whose two-century survey left out émigré authors, with the tired exception of Nabokov. More recent examples of the same elision range from Caryl Emerson's *The Cambridge Introduction to Russian Literature* (2008) to *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature* (2011). The second touts its historiography as "quite different" from extant practices; yet the volume's periodization, taxonomy, and terminology perpetuate outlived assumptions, including the reduction of the interwar Russian field of cultural production to its Soviet subsystem, with Russia Abroad as a minor aside in the book's overall structure.[69] Noting that "the question of Russian modernism's temporal and aesthetic boundaries remains widely debated," Harsha Ram tacitly acknowledged a situation of methodological chaos created by the ongoing integration of émigré literature into the purview of a scholarly field that had once dismissed Russia Abroad. It had taken modernist studies half a century to accept the possibility Ram mentioned so matter-of-factly in 2011: namely, that the émigrés "were by no means all political or aesthetic conservatives" and that "Russian modernism's post-revolutionary existence grew out of a compound of unique historical conditions including the adaptive capacities of Soviet writers, the emergence of a Russian modernist culture in emigration, and the vicissitudes of Soviet cultural policy."[70]

There are many benefits to revisiting the methodological assumptions perpetuated by the myth of 1917 and its corollary cultural border patrol. Such revision yields a fuller temporal and spatial atlas of Russian modernism—from fin-de-siècle Petersburg and Moscow to the fall of Paris. This integrative approach also allows us better to position Russian modernist culture vis-à-vis its Western counterparts. After all, exilic imagination was a key ingredient in the transnational modernist sensibility, obsessed with social, metaphysical, psychological, and cultural deracination, which was all too familiar to Russian émigrés.[71] Finally, this larger context imparts to Russian modernist experience in the late 1920s and 1930s, which I call here late Russian modernism, its philosophical and aesthetic specificity, making it a national case study in what Tim Armstrong describes as a distinct phase in the tripartite schema of transnational modernism (early—high—late) widely accepted in Western scholarly literature today.[72]

In this respect, it is worth recalling Adamovich's 1963 remark that "the

[Russian] literary period conventionally called Decadence or modernism" only "seemed to have breathed its last in 1917 [. . .] reviving soon afterward in new forms, in a new 'iteration,' as it were."[73] By unshackling modernist studies from obsolete methodological premises and integrating them with exilic studies, we are finally able to describe and evaluate late modernism with reference to other stages of Russian modernist culture and to its Western artistic and intellectual context—a task whose adequate implementation awaits a new cohort of scholars. What follows is a tentative and schematic sketch of the aesthetic and philosophical premises of late Russian modernism, arguing for the extension of Russian modernist chronology beyond the Bolshevik coup and the Stalinist Cultural Revolution.

Putting Late Russian Modernism on the Map

The genesis of the late modernist sensibility, aesthetic, and worldview cut across the geography and demographics of interwar Russian cultural life. But as this process was curtailed by political pressure in the USSR, it found its full expression only in Russia Abroad, where the modernist community came to be dominated by authors who matured in exile, many of them converging around the Parisian journal *Chisla*. The artists in question —Nina Berberova, Boris Bozhnev, Lidiia Chervinskaia, Iurii Fel'zen, Gaito Gazdanov, Aleksandr Ginger, Vasilii Ianovskii, Dovid Knut, Boris Poplavskii, Anna Prismanova, Sergei Sharshun, Anatolii Shteiger, among others—were born, mostly, between 1894 and 1905. Like their peers in the USSR—Isaac Babel, Daniil Kharms, Iurii Olesha, Boris Pil'niak, Nikolai Zabolotskii, the Serapion Brothers—most of them began as epigones of high modernism. In poetry, the horizon of younger émigrés was initially set by Futurist currents, Boris Pasternak, Marina Tsvetaeva, French Dada and Surrealism. In prose, their formative examples were Andrei Belyi, Aleksei Remizov, Viktor Shklovskii, and such Western writers as André Gide, James Joyce, and Marcel Proust. In the late 1920s, younger émigrés abandoned many high modernist practices still prominent among their coevals in the USSR, gaining a degree of artistic maturity and institutional organization that afforded a clear idea of their place in transnational modernism and in the polarized Russian field of cultural production.

It is, then, logical to start our sketch of late Russian modernism with its most apparent quality as the historical summit of Russian cultural openness to the West. True, Russian "new art" began by absorbing foreign models and fostering cosmopolitan ventures.[74] Sustained dialogue with Western mod-

ernists then lost steam in the late 1900s, when Russian "new art" took a nationalistic turn; came to a halt during the war; and never revived in the USSR, contrary to Russia Abroad. Converging on Berlin and Paris, exiles came into contact with local cultural markets, getting direct exposure to Western art and thought—an experience that informed their self-fashioning as *émigré* writers.[75] Characteristically, the consolidation of the Russian modernist community in Paris entailed frequent appeals to Western models.[76]

Another signal aspect of late Russian modernism was its self-perception as a community facing extinction from political repression, in the USSR, and from commercial mass culture, in the West. The resultant sense of being the last carriers of a tradition stimulated a systematic reappraisal of modernist legacy. Present in early Soviet Russia, this revision was even more prominent in emigration, where the *Chisla* circle styled itself as "the last of a series" by virtue of carrying on the heritage of Russian modernist culture.[77] Such professed continuity opened *Chisla* to the charge of reviving "fin-de-siècle Decadence," despite the group's critical approach to the modernist heritage.[78] To be sure, the urgent sense of crisis permeating the émigré modernist milieu capitalized on perennial features of the modernist sensibility, which Viacheslav Ivanov described, in 1921, as follows: "What is 'décadence'? It is the feeling of the most intimate organic connection to the monumental legacy of the past high culture, combined with the oppressive and exalted awareness that we are the last in its series."[79] What matters, then, is the concrete meaning given by late Russian modernism to its consciousness of crisis and its uses in motivating the community's creative activity, which acquires historical specificity in a longer temporal perspective.

To begin, the eschatological outlook of *early Russian modernism* turned on its head Paul Verlaine's famous dismissal of poetry that did not meet his aesthetic standard: "Et tout le reste est littérature" (And all the rest is literature).[80] Russian modernist culture sported a vocal anti-aesthetic current that recoded Verlaine's insult—"literature"—from a marker of low artistic value to a shorthand for art that did not fit into the model of writing as a prophetic act. In this model, the "idea of the end," to cite Merezhkovskii, trumped aesthetic concerns: the modernist carriers of eschatological premonitions found in Fëdor Tiutchev's prescription of silence—"An uttered thought is a lie" ("Silentium," 1830)—an ultimate remedy for the expressive inadequacy of language and a recipe for the anticipated "necessary end of Russian literature and of something larger [with it]."[81] Within this eschatologically minded tradition, artistic autonomy meant not the aestheticizing separation of art

from life but the aestheticization of life in a Promethean "life-creating" effort to (re-)spiritualize matter.[82]

By the late 1900s, inflationary overuse rendered early modernist mysticism trite, but the "idea of the end" retained its social resonance. In *high modernism*, eschatological aspirations to the collapse of the old social order—as a prerequisite for the "revolution of the spirit" that would remake the human condition—went hand in hand with aversion to "literariness." For many modernists, from the Cubo-Futurists to Vasilii Rozanov, "the idea of the end," and the attendant rejection of the institution of literature, held the key to the aesthetic iconoclasm of the 1910s: Rozanov saw his own prose as speeding up "the end of literature" and styled himself as "the last writer, after whom there would be no literature."[83] Attacking imaginative fiction for the sake of writing as a record of human subjectivity, he anticipated the documentary turn of *late modernism* toward expressive and imaginative restraint, scornful of formal perfection and artistic success.[84]

This eschatologically tinged, anti-aesthetic current was countered in a rival modernist reading of Verlaine's and Tiutchev's maxims, wherein scorn for "literature" expressed the cult of novelty. Here the rejection of outlived forms and epigonic clichés conveyed the desire to bridge the gap between human experience and its verbal articulation, whereas the postulate of artistic autonomy implied the imaginative self-sufficiency and intrinsic value of creative genius with respect to extra-artistic reality. Briusov, after paying his dues to the modernist (con)fusion of art and life, became a promoter of this countervailing trend. For him, aversion to "literariness" spelled not the desirable "end of literature" but the periodic renewal of worn-out aesthetic conventions.[85] Briusov's dismissal of anti-aesthetic striving beyond art found further articulation in Formalist thought—Shklovskii aestheticized Rozanov's prose as novelistic discourse with documentary motivation—whence it migrated into Nabokov's poetics.[86]

The tense coexistence of these artistic philosophies in Russian modernist culture came to the fore when fresh converts to the anti-aesthetic tradition found a rationale for the anticipated "death of literature" in a postwar/postrevolution "crisis of imagination," purportedly triggered by the enormity of Europe's cataclysms, which required a systematic revision of modernity's foundations. All truly modern authors, so went this transnational modernist theory, had to spurn the aestheticizing vanity of fiction for the sake of "factual" modes—confessional poetry and prose, diary, travelogue, memoir, psychological self-study, journalistic reportage, philosophical reflection, cul-

tural critique, and literary-historical essay.[87] Interwar European artistic life thus validated Russian modernism's anti-aesthetic current. Beginning with Paul Valéry's 1919 declaration of a spiritual crisis among cultural elites, the postwar French modernist cohort cast itself in terms of radical disruption, dubbed "the new malady of the century" with reference to the original romantic malaise. French modernists engaged in the same revisionist exercise as their Russian peers and with the same anti-aesthetic ethos, wherein the "sincerity" of supposedly documentary writing trumped the "literariness" of fiction.[88] This ethos informed the Surrealist treatment of art as a tool of psychological self-study; the penchant of new prose (e.g., Marcel Arland, L.-F. Céline, René Crevel, Pierre Drieu La Rochelle, Michel Leiris, Raymond Radiguet) for confessional solipsism, imaginative restraint, and deliberate artistic imperfection; the moralizing novels of "Catholic" authors (François Mauriac, Georges Bernanos) who castigated André Gide for being too "literary," even as he abandoned fiction in the late 1920s; and the increasingly common alibi against "literariness" that French artists found in public political causes.[89]

In Russia Abroad, the documentary turn fueled intra-modernist polemics between the *Chisla* circle, which espoused the anti-aesthetic tradition, and its opponents in Paris, Berlin, and Prague.[90] But this turn was also manifest in the USSR. Scholars explain the rise of the documentary aesthetic there as a defensive reaction to political pressure. But the concurrent rise of the same aesthetic in transnational modernist culture suggests the limitations of a political explanation. As Iurii Olesha and Mikhail Zoshchenko drifted away from fiction in the early 1930s, their motives went beyond politics. Zoshchenko insisted on the therapeutic intent of his psychological (self-) studies (*Vozvrashchennaia molodost'* [Youth regained], 1933; *Pered voskhodom solntsa* [*Before Sunrise*], 1943), rejecting their aestheticization as novelistic experiments and puzzling over the generic appurtenance of his writings, whose blend of fact and fiction echoed the "human document" model concurrently devised by émigré modernists.[91] Olesha, for his part, concluded that a diary was a more "interesting" discursive mode than imaginative writing, because the latter easily degenerated into "literature" and because a diary was a "sincere" and "factual" genre—traits encapsulating the striving for greater artistic realism in late modernist culture across Europe.[92]

Although the anti-aesthetic tradition came to dominate late Russian modernism, the discourse motivating a writer's self-negating striving for the Tiutchevian ideal of silence could not be carried over from earlier modernist

experience without adjustments. Like metaphysical eschatology a decade earlier, social eschatology lost its allure in the 1920s, when Russian modernists began to conceive of their situation in postapocalyptic terms.[93] Recent wars and revolutions belied the eschatological promise of the "idea of the end." Russia's cataclysms had not sired "the revolution of the spirit," frustrating the hope of a radical change in the human condition.[94] Disillusionment ruled late modernist subjectivity, whose proto-existentialist mix of pessimistic resignation and stoic defiance attained its fullest expression in the *Chisla* circle. From the vantage point of the 1920s, the ontological and transformative promises of "new art" looked unfulfilled. That art seemed exhausted by the metaphysical demagoguery of early modernism and the disruptive experimentalism of high modernism, whose formal iconoclasm only accelerated the devolution of writing into "literature" at a historical moment conceptualized by late modernist criticism as "the age of Salieri."[95] The broken hope of "the revolution of the spirit" justified the newly dominant anti-aesthetic ideal of documentary art. The *Chisla* circle tended to interpret the Tiutchevian call for silence more literally than did its predecessors: in its ascetic creative ideal, even Rozanov looked too "literary."[96]

To be sure, the last Russian modernist cohort initially advocated for imaginative, plot-driven, and anti-psychological prose. Separated from Western artistic life in the early 1920s, the Petrograd adepts of this model of writing—the Serapion Brothers, patronized by Shklovskii—saw it as Russian art's westward turn. Yet the Serapions' theoretical schemes yielded little beyond highly self-conscious crime and adventure prose filled with implicit contempt for "literature."[97] On the other side of the border, we find equally facetious and metaliterary simulacra of crime and adventure narratives in Nabokov's novels (*King, Queen, Knave*, 1928; *Glory*, 1931; *Despair*, 1934). But Nabokov stood out among his émigré modernist peers, who, unlike him, subscribed to the spiritual malaise of their French counterparts, adopting the rhetoric of the "new malady of the century" for the purposes of artistic self-legitimation.[98]

Echoing the ideal of "absolute sincerity" (Arland) dominant in France's late modernist aesthetic, the *Chisla* group elaborated its doctrine of the "human document" as a "responsible literary form" that married stylistic, prosodic, and narrative asceticism to autobiographically motivated imaginative restraint and psychological solipsism. In émigré "human documents," studied artistic imperfection enhanced the coveted effects of simplicity and authenticity, and conveyed the rejection of marketplace success as a "liter-

ary" striving.[99] In practice, this model was caught between its documentary motivation and the artifice of creative writing—a tension also familiar to the Soviet readers of Zoshchenko's psychological prose and Pasternak's memoir, *Okhrannaia gramota* (*Safe Conduct*, 1929–31), which self-consciously explored the boundary of fact and fiction.

As discontent with the outcome of war and revolution grew, so did modernist disillusionment in art's exalted status as a medium for transcending the human condition. Accordingly, the advocacy of artistic autonomy began to lose ground in transnational modernist culture to extra-artistic activism, with writing often becoming subservient to sociopolitical causes. A similar loss of faith in the autonomous transformative potential of art, exacerbated by its ideological subjugation in the USSR, forced many Russians to buck the trend among their Western counterparts. Witness the friction between those exiled veterans of Russian modernism who retained its traditional idea of art as a vehicle of change (Zinaida Gippius, Dmitrii Merezhkovskii) and the demurring *Chisla* milieu.[100] The postwar reappraisal of the modernist legacy thus had an ideological dimension. The Russian carriers of the late modernist sensibility dissociated cultural activity from political causes and faulted modernist culture's original eschatological ethos for contributing to Russia's sociopolitical catastrophe.[101]

Many émigré modernists countered their cultural community's past aspirations to the apocalyptic renewal of humanity with a different critique of modernity. Now the anticipation of "the rampage of barbarians eager to raze everything to the ground and rebuild it from scratch" gave way to reflection on the failure of this tabula rasa project and the concomitant "trepidation over the cracked vase" of European civilization caught between the total state and free-market mass culture.[102] Late Russian modernism's prerogative to save "ultimate spiritual values" by "taking them to the catacombs" capitalized, of course, on the community's perennial elitism.[103] Presently, however, Russian modernists recoiled not only from cultural democratization as a corollary of modernity but also from the abasement of cultural standards in the USSR under the slogan of "art for the masses."[104] In this respect, late Russian modernism formed an unbroken continuum with its Western counterparts, attuned as it was to the current apology for cultural elitism in the writings of José Ortega y Gasset, F. R. Leavis, and like-minded authors.[105]

Another aspect of late Russian modernism, befitting its anti-aestheticism and postapocalyptic skepticism, was the rejection of manifestos and "isms" as tools of self-legitimation (see chapter 1). In 1923, Adamovich argued that

fatigue from "literary noise and medley" had caused "the collapse of almost all our schools and movements," whence he extrapolated an imminent shift from modernism's "romantic" effervescence to a "neo-classical" aesthetic. This logic resonated across Russian cultural geography. In the USSR, Tynianov echoed the argument's first part, whereas Adamovich's conclusion reinforced the point recently made by Zhirmunskii and Mandel'shtam.[106] By the decade's close, Adamovich's conjecture became a fait accompli: Nikolai Otsup described *Chisla*'s artistic ideal as "dryer, humbler, purer, and more exigent" than previous, "excessively loud and exuberant," modernist art.[107] *Chisla* littérateurs brought to the common negative denominator the melodious and opaque verse of early modernism and the linguistic and prosodic disruption of the 1910s, in contrast to their "neoclassical" ideal of simpler and more ascetic writing.[108] Echoing T. S. Eliot's concurrent self-image as a "classicist in literature," the neoclassical turn of late Russian modernism drew on the community's tried-and-true practice of distinguishing between tradition and traditionalism (see chapter 2). The latter was "a sign of insensitivity" to one's epoch (Terapiano), while the former coexisted harmoniously with vanguardist claims.[109] In the 1920s and 1930s, such logic cut across transnational modernist culture, whose actors increasingly equated modern art to classicism, the better to expose the chaos of a civilization sapped by modernity, shattered by war, and in need of salvaging instead of a tabula rasa renewal.[110]

The late Russian modernist aesthetic began to take concrete outlines after 1925, when younger émigré poets shifted en masse from the Futurist-Dadaist model, predicated on ostentatious disruptive anti-canonicity, toward a praxis they saw, thanks to the critical tutelage of Adamovich and Khodasevich, as both neoclassical and vanguardist.[111] In tandem with this reappraisal of recent poetic models, émigrés rued the continued reliance of prose writers on devices codified by Belyi and Remizov and validated by Formalist theories—stylistic expressionism, rhythmical syntax, colloquial stylization, narrative collage. This aesthetic shift was a milestone in the gestation of late Russian modernism, which coexisted, in the 1920s, with high modernist practices in poetry (Maiakovskii and his epigones, OBERIU [the Union of Real Art], Tsvetaeva) and prose (Belyi, Nabokov, Remizov, Shklovskii, Olesha, Vaginov, Zdanevich).[112] Émigré Parisians denounced such practices as "a contrived modernist style" and "a risible longing for 'novelty' at any cost."[113] Russianists have never identified this aesthetic shift as indicative of modernist culture's transition to a new historical iteration, even though Russian artists actively partook in the contemporary transnational quest for

"a new classicism," as Riding and Graves put it in 1927, with reference to Anglo-American modernist culture.[114] Instead, scholars have read the interwar neoclassical turn as an echo of earlier Russian modernist battles.

Consider the interpretation of émigré poetry as Acmeism's revenge over Futurism, proffered by the pioneer of Russian modernist studies, Vladimir Markov. *Chisla*'s foes were the first to speak about a putative conflict between the neo-Acmeist "Paris school" and the neo-Futurist "Prague school."[115] The argument overlooked the history of émigré poetry in Paris, whose first decade had been ruled by high modernist models, from Maiakovskii to Tsvetaeva. The crux of the argument was in the equation of Acmeism with aesthetic reaction, borrowed from old Futurist polemics to debunk *Chisla*'s vanguardist claims.[116] Unfamiliar with émigré literary politics, Markov drew selectively on interwar debates, helping to codify the vision of Russia Abroad as a space of cultural reaction.[117] But if we heed the terms in which the *Chisla* affiliates articulated their agenda, we will see differently their place in modernist history. In 1959, Iurii Terapiano, one of the first Parisians to rebel against the Futurist-Dadaist model, dismissed the nascent scholarly view of *Chisla* poetry as "post-Acmeist": "For it would be more precise to speak about 'the Paris note': [which was generally] *post* [with respect to] Symbolism, Acmeism, Futurism, formism; essentially representing a reaction to everything that had preceded it [. . .] Our struggle with Acmeism was brief, since it was not really difficult to overcome it [*akmeizm preodolet'*]." Terapiano's final phrase alluded to Zhirmunskii's famous reading of Acmeism as "the overcoming of Symbolism," adopting this trope to the circumstances of émigré modernism. For Terapiano, "the overcoming of Acmeism" indicated the same qualitative change in historical cycles as the poetic transition from early to high modernism recorded by Zhirmunskii.[118] In a transparent jab at Markov, Terapiano complained that uninformed postwar arrivals misinterpreted émigré modernism, "parroting its simplistic understanding by journalists and foes who had deliberately distorted it [in the 1930s]." Markov's reading of *Chisla*'s poetry obfuscated the reasons for its aversion to "'the abysses and mysteries' and the metaphysical rhetoric of the Symbolists," as well as to "the primitive flatness of Acmeism, Futurism, and Formalism."[119] In 1960, Adamovich offered a similar rebuttal: "Exile left no room for the Acmeist aesthetic in the major key which we countered with a revision of the past. Georgii Ivanov and I could not have considered reviving Acmeism in emigration. The so-called *Paris note* was a longing for simplicity. Z. Gippius and Khodasevich also sought simplicity. The ascetic

mood of émigré poetry was alien to Acmeism's optimistic assertiveness. We wanted to find the ultimate, final, miraculous words which did not exist [. . .] Acmeism had not sought ultimate words, being a literary supplement to a beautiful, joyous life."[120] Several aspects of this statement merit attention. "Simplicity" was the code word used by *Chisla* authors to signal their rejection of conspicuous experiment in high modernism. *Chisla* shared in the perennial modernist agenda of seeking an answer to Tiutchev's dictum in "the ultimate, final, miraculous words." But unlike its "optimistic" precursors, late modernism knew the futility of this quest to bridge the gap between human experience and its articulation ("words which did not exist"). Hence the deflation of high modernist anti-canonicity as means for expressing human subjectivity; hence also the prestige of the documentary aesthetic, whose imaginative, stylistic, and narrative restraint looked neoclassical against the backdrop of high modernist practices. A similar aesthetic shift marked the careers of *Chisla*'s émigré modernist opponents, such as Khodasevich, and of modernists in the USSR. Consider the evolution of Babel, Pasternak, and Pil'niak, in the late 1920s, toward stylistic and narrative "simplicity" and "factual" motivation, reductively explained in literary scholarship by political pressure alone.

The time has come to reconsider our traditional interpretation of the shift of Russian modernists away from their culture's once salient features—manifesto-based self-definition steeped in the rhetoric of novelty; experimental anti-canonicity in style, narrative, and prosody; emphatic metaliterariness; focus on artistic autonomy; and belief in art's universally transformative power—either as political conformism, the way Pasternak's trajectory is often described, or as retrograde traditionalism, imputed to émigrés.[121] By the mid-1920s, the modernist understanding and valuation of experiment and innovation changed as much as they had during the culture's qualitative transformation on the eve of the war. As discussed in chapter 2, early Russian modernism deprioritized aesthetic iconoclasm, pegging artistic originality to the intuitive exploration and erudite recreation of "true" reality. High modernism, in turn, was preoccupied with the psyche as the source of reality, encouraging stylistic and narrative anti-canonicity as means to convey human subjectivity. This aesthetic of shock and disruption grew trite within a decade. Late modernism preserved the focus on psychological subjectivity but sought alternative ways to approximate "true" reality at a time when formal originality had ostensibly failed as an answer to Tiutchev's dictum, "An uttered thought is a lie." In this respect, Russians actively par-

took of Europe's "late modernist moment," which was hostile to "a certain type of modernist fiction dominated by an aesthetics of formal mastery," and strove to "deflate the category of form as a criterion for judging literary works."[122]

The retreat from self-conscious experimentalism echoed previous modernist purification projects that sought to safeguard "genuine" art from "cheap modern style."[123] Having used this contrast to castigate modernist foes, Belyi himself became a foil to the community's new cohort, which berated his prose, in the 1920s, as a relic of the "Przybyszewski generation"—a demeaning conflation of early modernism's outlived aspects with Belyi's still influential aesthetic.[124] The main practice under fire was high modernism's emphasis on the creative process and artistic material. In its heyday this practice framed the transition of "new art" from tired metaphysical speculation to psychological subjectivism. Metareflection was high modernism's basic claim to verisimilitude: as the sole means of insight into "true" reality, art reflected only itself. But as overt metaliterariness grew trite through overuse, it lost its *a realibus ad realiora* rationale. Late Russian modernism synthesized the mystical longing of early modernism's *a realibus ad realiora* quest with the psychological subjectivism of high modernism. But it operated this fusion on its own terms, wherein resignation to Tiutchev's pessimistic dictum informed the ideal of ascetic and documentary art in contrast to the metaphysical grandiloquence of early modernism and to the flashy anticanonicity of high modernism.[125] Hence Adamovich's dismissal of Shklovskii's and Mandel'shtam's prose and Tsvetaeva's poetry as vestiges of an outlived aesthetic, and the contemporary modernist critique of Tynianov's novels as "artificial."[126]

Émigrés codified high modernism's self-conscious experimentalism as a "Soviet" aesthetic feature. This correlation had much to do with the divergent fates of the Russian modernist community on both sides of the geopolitical divide. In the USSR, literary metareflection got a second lease on life with the onset of Stalinism. Responding to ramped-up ideological pressure on cultural producers, modernist metafictions—for example, Marietta Shaginian's *KiK* (1929), Konstantin Vaginov's *Kozlinaia pesn'* (*The Goat Song*, 1927) and *Trudy i dni Svistonova* (*The Works and Days of Svistonov*, 1929), Veniamin Kaverin's *Skandalist* (The scandal-monger, 1928) and *Khudozhnik neizvesten* (*The Unknown Artist*, 1931)—contemplated the vicissitudes of the creative process and agency in Soviet modernity.[127] Ultimately driven underground in the USSR (cf. Bulgakov's *Master and Margarita*), high modernist

metafiction persisted in Russia Abroad, notably, in Nabokov's magnum opus, *The Gift* (1937–38).

Incidentally, Nabokov chose André Gide's novel *The Counterfeiters* (1926) as his metafictional model at a time when Gide had already transitioned to the late modernist sensibility, abandoning imaginative writing for the documentary aesthetic and political activism.[128] Nabokov embraced some aspects of late modernism—aversion to "isms" and manifestos, the rejection of art's Promethean ambition—while largely adhering to the high modernist aesthetic. Consider the writer's cult of imagination, his enduring concern with the creative process and agency, the self-conscious narrative complexity of his novels, and their studied stylistic expressionism.[129] Defying the evolution of transnational modernism, Nabokov's prose was a far cry from the "human document" agenda of the *Chisla* group, which censured his writings as too "literary" to have spiritual value.[130] True, Nabokov's *Chisla* foes did not entirely abandon the high modernist aesthetic. Iurii Fel'zen, for instance, used Marcel Proust's *In Search of Lost Time* (1913–27) as a springboard for his own autobiographically motivated novelistic project depicting, like *The Gift*, the maturation of an émigré writer. Unlike Nabokov, Fel'zen toned down the metafictional dimension of his French model, trying to conform to the "human document" doctrine. Unsuccessfully, let us add, since he ultimately resolved the documentary aesthetic's inherent tension between fact and fiction in favor of the latter.[131] Both authors drew on high modernist sources. But in the factious modernist community, *Chisla* hailed the metafiction of its associate, Fel'zen, condemning the same features in the art of its opponents.

Nabokov's place in the literary process shows the danger of neat historical narratives casting cultural periods and artistic practices in chronological succession. The historical iterations of Russian modernist culture often overlapped, offering a range of options to its exponents. In the early 1920s, Osip Mandel'shtam voiced a credo foreshadowing the neoclassical ethos of late modernism. But as the decade wore on, his poetry and prose drew closer to the practices he himself had decried in the works of Belyi, Maiakovskii, and Tsvetaeva.[132] Incidentally, as Mandel'shtam's poetics evolved toward high modernist anti-canonicity and obscurity, Pasternak and Babel drew closer to the late modernist ideal of simplicity, embarking on a program of stylistic, narrative, and imaginative restraint.

The task of interpreting late Russian modernism is further complicated by deceptive terminological overlaps between its discursive self-presentation and the parallel elaboration of the properly Soviet aesthetic, allowing some

scholars to speak about "Stalinist late modernism" (Eshelman) and to cast modernist practices in the 1920s–30s as portents of Russian postmodernism (Lipovetskii).[133] In fact, the Socialist Realist denunciation of modernist legitimation techniques only suppressed competing "isms" and manifestoes, in contrast to the conceptual rejection of such devices in late modernism. Similarly, if in the Marxist lexicon "simplicity" meant art's accessibility to the average reader, and "formalism" denoted deviations from the nineteenth-century Realist canon, late modernist criticism invoked "formalism" as a marker of the disavowed high modernist aesthetic, which seemed immature in comparison to the ideal of "simpler" art, whose *effect* of simplicity required a readership privy to high modernist practices.[134] In yet another deceptive overlap, Stalinist and late modernist aesthetics staked claims to ultimate realism, differently understood. Using Irving Howe's characterization of modernist art as "a turn from truth to sincerity," we can sum up this difference as follows.[135] Marxism perpetuated the positivist belief in objective laws ("truth") governing life. Late modernism was disabused of all such grand schemes, translating its disillusionment into an attitude of stoic skepticism that replaced a quest for "truth" with a striving for an authentic ("sincere") response to the chaos of modernity. Attacking Belyi's prose as "artificial" and "insincere," late modernists targeted an outlived aesthetic that no longer conveyed their sensibility, while Stalinists castigated it, in the same terms, as a faithful expression of the faulty modernist philosophy of life, past and present.[136]

The geopolitical polarization of the Russian field of cultural production adds to the potential confusion of the late modernist and Stalinist critical discourses. Consider the lack of distinction in scholarship among an expression of the documentary aesthetic, the "literature of the fact," theorized by the modernists of the LEF (the Left Front of Art), and the promotion of mass authorship by the Marxists of the RAPP (the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers), bent on engineering "proletarian literature."[137] The events overlapped in time and ostensible rationale. The LEF theorists opportunistically couched their schemes in Marxist rhetoric, casting in politically correct terms their persistent belief in art's Promethean role as an agent of the "revolution of the spirit": witness their recycling of the early modernist notion of *zhiznetvorchestvo* (life creation) into that of *zhiznestroenie* (life building).[138] But rhetorical similarities in the critical discourses of modernists and Marxists obscure a more consequential parallelism of artistic models in the modernist circles of émigré Paris and Soviet Moscow. Cross-border conti-

nuity is hidden behind the smokescreen of their ideological enmity. Yet one is struck by the conceptual kinship of the LEF's and *Chisla*'s thought.

The "literature of the fact" and "human document" doctrines continued Russian modernism's anti-aesthetic tradition, while partaking in the general evolution of transnational modernism.[139] Both railed against "literariness" and "formalism," even if the LEF revered its Cubo-Futurist heritage, which was the émigrés' favorite target. Both desacralized art and authorship because, in the "age of Salieri," writers were no longer "priests" but either "craftsmen" responding to the social needs of their reader (LEF), or self-analysts in sync with the reader's spiritual needs (*Chisla*). Both doctrines fused art and life, praising "documents" over imaginative writing. Yet, the LEF, for its political reasons, designated the objective reportage of social life as the main subject matter of literature predicated on the "deindividualization" of authors in collaborative projects. *Chisla* codified documentary content as the individual's idiosyncratic reaction to the surrounding world. Political context may also explain the Muscovites' investment in the premise of art's Promethean power, which could be expediently cloaked in the Marxist rhetoric of building a new society. In contrast, the dominant attitude among modernists who did not rally to the Soviet cause was that of disenchantment in the promise of the "revolution of the spirit" and the attendant sense of embodying the coda rather than the radical beginning of a cultural tradition.

Historical circumstances made all the difference in the respective impact of the two doctrines. The "literature of the fact" predated the "human document" but was curtailed by Stalinism and remained largely theoretical. *Chisla*'s agenda gave rise to a decade-long practical implementation. Scholars usually place the LEF's theories outside creative activity. But this verdict does not account for the specificity of late modernism, which downgraded imagination in favor of documentary motivation, codifying literary and cultural theory as a form of creative expression. Characteristically, while émigrés wrote off the LEF's "literature of the fact" doctrine as ideologically conformist, Stalinists insisted on its affinities with current modernist literary life abroad.[140] Debates surrounding the LEF's and *Chisla*'s agendas testify to the complex dynamic of historical change in Russian modernist culture. Few exponents of high modernism (the LEF included quite a number of them, starting with Maiakovskii) were untouched by the late modernist sensibility. Thus, the writings of Formalists exemplified the documentary turn by virtue of upsetting old generic divisions and aestheticizing genres hitherto seen as extra-artistic. Yet Formalists also attacked the LEF's "literature of the fact"

theory for its anti-aestheticism and naïve realism.[141] A similar dynamic informed émigré critical debates. Khodasevich spearheaded opposition to the "human document" model, but his own artistic trajectory from fiction to criticism and scholarship exemplified late modernism's documentary turn.[142]

In sum, late Russian modernism has gone *unrecognized* in scholarship, because our assumptions about the "what," "where," and "when" of the modernist community have kept us from asking questions that could constitute a field of inquiry. I would like to propose that much of what has been chalked up to the alleged traditionalism of the émigré cultural subsystem represents not a disruption but the evolution of Russian modernism toward its next historical stage, an evolution keeping pace with similar developments in the USSR, before the modernist community was crushed there, and in transnational modernist culture. Russian modernist studies need to reconfigure the geography of their research object, which cuts across geopolitical borders in ways unknown even to its nomadic Anglo-American counterpart. In accounting for such spatial expansiveness, we will also gain new insights into the thorny issues of Russian modernism's historical chronology.

Chronologies of Russian Modernism

If the year 1917 remained, for decades, the default demarcator of Russian modernism's upper temporal limit, there has been no consensus about its lower bracket. Some scholars designate the starting point in 1892–93, citing the appearance of a revamped *Severnyi vestnik*, the first periodical open to the "new sensibility," and of Merezhkovskii's manifesto, *On the Reasons for the Decline and on the New Trends in Contemporary Russian Literature*.[143] Others draw the starting line in 1894–95—the years of Briusov's *Russian Symbolists* almanacs.[144] The elusive beginning has also been pegged at 1896, when the cumulative effect of "new art" became manifest in the Russian field of cultural production.[145] Still other authors interpret the 1898–99 launch of *Mir iskusstva*, a journal entirely devoted to the promotion of "new art," as Russian modernism's true takeoff.[146] Unsurprisingly, then, many scholars opt for vague formulae, locating Russian modernism's birth in the "early/mid-/late 1890s," at "the turn of the century," or simply "in the 1890s."[147]

Cognate scholarly fields offer little help in setting the lower boundary of Russian modernism. Historically, modernist studies were dominated by Anglo-American literary scholarship, which either dismissed "new" art and thought of the period before the 1910s as "late romanticism" or pushed the timeline back to Baudelaire, Flaubert, and Wagner.[148] Identifying their sub-

ject matter with the high modernist canon—"radically innovating experimental art" (Williams)—students of Anglo-American modernism routinely began their investigations with Eliot, Joyce, and Pound, omitting Morris, Wilde, and Yeats, who had been read in their own day as exponents of "new art."[149] The new modernist studies have challenged the traditional chronology of Anglophone modernism, paying special attention to its early stage.[150] But this revisionist effort has not impacted views on Russian modernist chronology. Nor have French and German scholarship offered practical alternatives. The former has largely resisted the notion of modernism as a conceptual tool of literary history, whereas the latter has struggled no less than Russianists with "the confining Anglo-American canonization of high modernism into which most of German and Austrian modernism simply does not fit."[151]

Although it would be artificial and counterproductive to peg the birth of Russian modernism to a specific event, a cultural historian yearns for more precision than is currently available in the scholarship. Our approach to charting Russian modernism in time could also use some methodological diversification. We need to account not only for historical events but also for the self-perception of individuals producing or directly impacted by such events. I propose, then, to track the generational self-consciousness of actors in Russian modernist culture as a prop for its chronological remapping. The writing of history from the generational viewpoint boasts a rich tradition whose most valuable aspect, for our purposes, resides in the elaboration of the generation as a sociological rather than a biological concept, that is, as a group united not so much by age as by shared historical experience. As members of such "generation units" (Mannheim) make sense of their experience, the resulting cultural mythologies motivate their worldviews and aesthetic and philosophical choices.[152] Each self-styled generation must continuously adjust its self-description to new experiences and nascent "generation units." I will use such intra- and intergenerational dynamic in the Russian modernist community as an additional test of the relative importance of historical events cited in support of various modernist chronologies.

As far as the beginnings of Russian modernism go, a few signposts let us narrow the range of options. Since we are not concerned with a specific practice or idea understood as modernist but with a cultural community that emerges when an artistic and intellectual milieu self-consciously identifies with all such practices and ideas, the lower chronological limit of Russian modernism could be justifiably located in 1895–96.

On the one hand, treating Merezhkovskii's programmatic 1892 talk, published in 1893, as the inaugural event of modernism in Russia, we overestimate this conceptually vague text, which had no documented impact on modernist art and thought.[153] Similarly, if we identify the birth of modernism with *Severnyi vestnik*'s assault on the intelligentsia's artistic and philosophical canon, begun in 1893, we overlook the journal's hostility to aesthetically unorthodox expressions of "new art." Such hostility suggests the transitional nature of *Severnyi vestnik* as a venue only partially open to the modernist sensibility. Symptomatically, *Severnyi vestnik* died from self-inflicted wounds, since its wavering position alienated both the modernist community and the traditional intelligentsia readership.[154]

On the other hand, we could read expressions of heightened artistic self-consciousness—the proliferation of named and self-naming groups and programs—as benchmarks of nascent modernism, whose onomastic and manifesto-writing frenzy, unprecedented in cultural history, represented a distinct method of artistic identity formation.[155] If in France this practice crystallized in 1886, it did so in Russia in 1894–95, when Briusov's almanacs contrasted Symbolists to Decadents and new romantics (see chapter 1). The tenuousness of Briusov's self-declared group and of his proposed modernist taxonomy, and the dissonance between the almanacs' artistic level and their grandstanding are not as important, for our purposes, as the overriding identification with a movement on display in *Russian Symbolists*—all the more so because Briusov's public, largely dismissive of the modernist sensibility's literary expressions, took for granted the existence of a cultural community informed by that sensibility. The cumulative effect of modernist writing was visible already in 1895, when Briusov opened the third issue of his almanac with a retort to the many detractors of "new art," which had clearly captured general attention.

Nikolai Bogomolov has placed this "transformation of quantity into quality" in the year 1896, but witnesses to nascent Russian modernism retrospectively designated 1895 as its *annus mirabilis*.[156] It was in 1895 that the floodgates of "new art" burst open. In St. Petersburg, *Severnyi vestnik* serialized novels by Merezhkovskii (*Otverzhennyi* [The outcast]) and Sologub (*Tiazhelye sny* [Heavy dreams]). The third issue of Briusov's almanac and his first book of verse (*Chefs d'oeuvre*) came out in Moscow, setting modernist geography along the Petersburg-Moscow axis. Aleksandr Dobroliubov debuted with his scandalous poetic collection, *Natura naturans. Natura naturata*. Bal'mont followed up his 1894 book of verse, *Pod severnym nebom* (Under

the northern sky), with the more ostentatiously "Decadent" *V bezbrezhnosti* (In the infinite). Compared to 1895, the following year was one of consolidation. In 1896, Merezhkovskii's and Sologub's novels appeared in book form, accompanied by their declaratively modernist volumes of verse, *Novye stikhotvoreniia* (New poems) and *Teni* (Shadows) respectively. In the same year, Zinaida Gippius published her first book of poetry and prose, *Novye liudi* (New people). We find more signs of modernist culture's consolidation in the concurrent emergence of generational identity among its actors.

Merezhkovskii's 1896 verse collection contained a programmatic poem, "Deti nochi" (Children of the night), attributing the "new sensibility" to a specific generation (his own). The term "new" had also acquired by then distinct generational implications. Liubov' Gurevich narrated her editorial takeover of *Severnyi vestnik* as a clash of generations, with age as a corollary of worldview: a Populist, in her story, was inevitably older than a carrier of the "new sensibility."[157] The public of early modernists concurred with their self-stylization as a "generation unit," willy-nilly endorsing their cultural mythology despite significant age differences among them.[158] Pioneer modernists were not much younger than their foes, as Gippius later admitted, observing that "not all 'innovators' belonged, by age, to the new cohort, while the opposite camp harbored many young people."[159] If Briusov and Dobroliubov, in their early twenties in 1895–96, still fit the bill of young art, the same was hardly true of Bal'mont, Gippius, and Gurevich, who were pushing thirty; of Sologub, Merezhkovskii, and Volynskii, who were past thirty; and of Minskii, who was "a young poet of forty," as a critic ironically noted.[160] Nonetheless, the crystallization of its generational identity confirms Russian modernism's emergence as a cultural community by 1896.

If we treat the years 1895–96 as the lower temporal bracket of Russian modernist culture—the time of its formation and self-assertion—then the oft-invoked boundary of 1899–1901 will demarcate not modernism's beginning but its institutionalization in the Russian field of cultural production. The rise of a framework for the dissemination of "new" art and thought was manifest in the dedicated ventures that replaced the irresolute *Severnyi vestnik*, namely, the review *Mir iskusstva* (Petersburg, 1898/99–1904) and the Skorpion publishers, whose almanac, *Severnye tsvety* (Moscow, 1901–3), became "the first broadly representative collection of the consciously experimental modernist tendency."[161] Run by Briusov, the almanac was instrumental in sketching the outlines of early modernism. The omnivorousness of the inaugural issue did not last. Authors tenuously related to modernist culture

(Chekhov, Bunin) vanished from the almanac's subsequent issues; others were recruited despite their differing agendas and factional loyalties (Belyi, Blok, Viacheslav Ivanov, Remizov, Voloshin).[162] Such broad intra-modernist inclusiveness, driven by the hostility of the intelligentsia mainstream to "new art," marked all early modernist periodicals, from *Mir iskusstva* and *Novyi put'* (1902–4) to *Vesy* (in 1904–5) and *Voprosy zhizni* (1905).[163]

As this common front crumbled during the first crisis of Russian modernism, the community's fragmentation—on display in the feud between Briusov's *Vesy* and the newly minted *Fakely* (1906–8) and *Zolotoe runo* (1906–9)—furnished a clear index of the culture's incipient evolution toward a qualitatively different phase.[164] If there is a conclusion to be drawn from post-1905 factional bickering, it is that modernists were no longer on the defensive in the Russian field of cultural production, being comfortable enough in their identities and within their community's institutional framework to dispense with a unified front vis-à-vis the cultural mainstream. In fact, one can posit a direct causal link between the growing prestige of "new art" in post-1905 Russia and the mounting discord among modernists, who were eager to translate newfound public favor into professional advantages.

We find more signs of Russian modernism's evolution in the changing self-image of its actors, who stopped identifying with a single cohort as the role of generational identity mutated from a tool of self-legitimation in larger cultural life into a weapon of intra-modernist polemics. In 1903, Belyi spoke of "our generation" with reference to the modernist culture as a whole. In 1905, he already distinguished his own generation from that of its "teachers"—Gippius, Merezhkovskii, Minskii, Rozanov, Volynskii—the better to dismiss them as out of touch with the "new sensibility."[165] Mushrooming generational identities grew narrower. Entering literary life circa 1905, Khodasevich (b. 1886) thought that he and Belyi (b. 1880) belonged to different generations. Viktor Gofman (b. 1884) thought that he and several other poets, including Blok (b. 1880), formed a new generation in contrast to old fogies Briusov (b. 1873) and Belyi. Briusov first styled himself as an artistic elder to Belyi and Blok (see his poem "Mladshim" [To the young ones, 1905]) but changed his mind in 1907, splitting "new art" into two large cohorts: that of "genuine creators"—wherein he included the late bloomer Mikhail Kuzmin (b. 1872), despite Belyi's and Blok's objections—and that of the post-1905 "barbarians."[166]

Early Russian modernism's transition to its next historical iteration was not clear cut. Few of the ideas and practices central to the culture's early

stage vanished outright. Nor did any modernist generation have a monopoly on a specific philosophy or aesthetic. Early modernist traditions persisted in the writings of seasoned littérateurs (Bal'mont, Merezhkovskii, Sologub) and of younger epigones after high modernist practices had come to dominate the culture's artistic and intellectual life. Furthermore, some veteran modernists—Belyi, Remizov, Rozanov—actually spearheaded the new practices. When I speak of changing historical cycles, then, I mean the evolving status of aesthetic and philosophical practices coexisting in the Russian modernist community at different moments in its life—practices we tend to associate with the culture's specific self-styled cohorts. The continued coexistence of older and newer practices poses a challenge to Russian modernism's historical periodization. For example, reading the post-1905 factionalism of "new art" as evidence of changing historical cycles, we must still confront the fact that the watershed between *early* and *high* Russian modernism is a matter of intra-modernist debate, with opinions split along two lines: 1909–10 and 1912–13.

The first demarcator relies on the vision of 1910 as "the year of Symbolism's crisis." This vision is informed by the last concerted effort of some early modernists (Blok, Briusov, Ivanov, Merezhkovskii) to define the elusive notion of Symbolism and thereby reassert their eroding authority in a modernist culture undergoing institutional changes thanks to intense competition among its factions and cohorts. Witness the 1909 cessation of *Vesy* and *Zolotoe runo* and the launch of *Apollon*, or Tynianov's retrospective designation of 1909 as the lower chronological limit for an unrealized novel about the cultural period that augured his own budding cohort.[167] Like all previous attempts at defining Symbolism, the 1910 project fizzled out in acrimonious bickering that, in the context of intergenerational modernist rivalry, made a lasting impression. Thus, in the preface (1919) to his unfinished poem *Vozmezdie* (Retribution), Blok endorsed the year 1910 as the axis of modernist experience, anachronistically fusing "the crisis of Symbolism" with the birth of Acmeism and Futurism, and glossing over the fact that the 1910 debate was only the latest expression of a long polemic.[168]

This polemic was a staple of Russian modernism's post-1905 crisis, during which the coveted badge of "genuine Symbolism" shielded "new art" from the implications of its market success. The sheer intensity of the 1906–8 debates about Symbolism's meaning makes later disputes look like aftershocks. In the mid-1900s, though, this intra-modernist polemic went unheeded by outsiders and neophytes, who were still coming to terms with modernism's

public success, which made it look like a coherent and monolithic entity.[169] Yet Symbolism was always a contested notion in modernist culture (see chapter 1), whose intellectual and aesthetic heterogeneity hid behind the façade of unity as long as the national field of cultural production was dominated by the intelligentsia establishment. By 1910, with the intelligentsia's philosophical and artistic canon in tatters, the newly attentive public finally noticed cracks in the modernist façade. The belated discovery became known as "the crisis of Symbolism"—an anachronistic notion truncating the post-1905 crisis of the Russian modernist community, in whose chronological chart the year 1910 is hardly a meaningful signpost, despite its round-date allure.[170]

In her historiographic reflections, Akhmatova (b. 1889) paid lip service to Blok's focus on 1910, insisting on a more important landmark, namely, her generation's "rebellion" against early modernism's "nineteenth-century mind-set," superseded, according to her, in 1914, when the war inaugurated another worldview and, by the same token, another phase in modernist experience.[171] Akhmatova's anchoring of chronology in generational identity was typical for those who drew the line between Russian modernism's historical stages not in 1910 but later, most often in 1912–13. Those years indeed witnessed the institutional self-assertion of the post-1905 cohort overlapping with what Robert Wohl has identified, on the transnational scale, as the "fourth modernist generation," born in the late 1880s–early 1890s and "growing up *within* modernism in a way that no previous generation could have."[172] For all its diversity and factiousness, Akhmatova's cohort shared a common identity visible in the manifestos of 1912–13 and informed by Russian modernism's generalized shift from metaphysical speculation to psychological subjectivism.[173] Symptomatically, in his stock-taking 1916 essay "Those Who Overcame Symbolism," Zhirmunskii (b. 1891) glossed over "the crisis of Symbolism," focusing instead on the events of 1912–13 (Acmeism).[174] Eikhenbaum (b. 1886), favoring a different high modernist model (Cubo-Futurism), also saw the literary-historical significance of these prewar years as far superior to that of 1909–10.[175] And Khlebnikov (b. 1885), a central member of the Cubo-Futurist faction, made public in 1914 an entire theory of generations, complete with tentative laws of generational continuity and antagonism historicizing the intellectual lineage of his artistic cohort.[176]

Having proposed 1895–96 and 1912–13 as the more defensible temporal markers, respectively, for the birth of Russian modernist culture and for the

crystallization of its second (high) historical phase, I now turn to the most contentious chronological issue of all—the community's outer limit. In 1976, Eugene Lampert wrote about the Russian modernist timeline, "It cannot be said with certainty when this period began [. . .] But we know for certain that it ended in 1917."[177] The myth of 1917 started to shed its aura of certainty soon thereafter. First in the West, then in the USSR, scholars explored alternative timelines in the process of reappraising interwar cultural history, obfuscated in dogmatic Soviet historiography. Positing the 1920s as the last decade of Russian modernist culture, the dissenting academic opinion entertained a range of end dates, each justified by a selective focus on specific events—from the party-state's fluctuating policies to the mass migration of cultural producers to the deaths of particular authors.[178] Accordingly, Russian modernism's expiration date was set in 1921–22 (Clark), in 1924 (Bohachevsky, Rosenthal), in 1925 (Bethea, Bogomolov, Bowlt, Bristol), in "the mid-1920s" (Gasparov), and in "the late 1920s" (Roberts).[179] Outliers drew on the concept of the "historical avant-garde," differently understood, either truncating Russian modernism around the First World War (Khazanov—1913; Etkind—1915), or expanding it to 1935–36 (Dobrenko, Gutkin).[180] Few revisionist chronological schemes accounted for Russian modernism's life in exile.[181]

Things were further complicated by the lasting impact of high modernism's canonization in Anglo-American scholarship, which, until the rise of the new modernist studies, drew the outer limit of modernism circa 1930—an approach making sense "in terms of British and also US literature but, perhaps, not in terms of any other in Europe," as one of its practitioners allowed.[182] This methodology was unnecessarily reductive even with regard to Anglo-American modernism.[183] Recent scholarship has pushed the outer boundary of Anglophone modernism to the Second World War and its aftermath, elaborating the concept of late modernism.[184] This theoretical development has not yet found its reflection in Russian modernist studies, where it could be extremely useful, given the field's lack of adequate conceptual tools for describing the life of Russian modernism in the interwar period.

Charting in time the passage from high to late Russian modernism, we find helpful indices in the generational identities of the culture's actors. These identities remained stable in the 1910s but began to shift in the 1920s, when "those who had been young circa 1905" (Eikhenbaum) felt more affinity with their elders than with the modernist community's up-and-coming cohort.[185] This generational dynamic was reinforced by sweeping demo-

graphic changes in the Russian field of cultural production as a result of Bolshevik policies and civil war.[186] Ivanov-Razumnik was not alone in airing, in 1924–25, his premonition of a radical change in modernist culture whose preceding quarter century he described as a literary "golden age" created by a single generation distinct from the budding modernist cohort.[187] A similar awareness of changing historical cycles sparked the Formalist debate about the value of the generation as an analytical tool of cultural historiography.[188] It also engendered a flurry of stock-taking surveys reconceptualizing Russian modernist experience with a renewed passion for periodization. All this echoed the historiographic frenzy of the late 1900s and early 1910s (see chapter 1), which accompanied another transitional period in Russian modernism. Only now, each proposed period—whether "the early Symbolism of the 1890s–1900s" (Evgen'ev-Maksimov) or the still ongoing "post-Symbolism" (Mirskii)—negated former generational divisions, dismissing once-crucial aesthetic and philosophical differences between modernist cohorts as fundamentally irrelevant.[189]

Born between the mid-1890s and mid-1900s, the new arrivals in the Russian modernist community came of age as artists and thinkers in the 1920s. Despite the broad spectrum of credos and practices—from the Futurist-Dadaist model of Leningrad's OBERIU (also embraced by young Parisian exiles in the early 1920s) to the neoclassical ideal of the almanacs *Chet i nechet* (Moscow) and *Chisla* (Paris)—this cohort grounded its generational identity in recent sociopolitical cataclysms and the attendant impasse of "modern" art and thought.[190] Steeped in postapocalyptic disenchantment with the original promises of "new art," the last Russian modernist cohort differed from its Western counterparts—the "Auden generation" in England, the "new children of the century" in France—by shunning political commitment in a gesture of countercultural defiance.[191] The articulation of this cohort's generational self-awareness is the clearest index of Russian modernism's transition to its ultimate historical stage. The concurrent onset of Stalinism—which leveled aesthetic, philosophical, and generational distinctions among cultural producers—stimulated by counterexample generational self-fashioning in the modernist community. Unlike the increasingly homogeneous Soviet cultural subsystem, literary life in Russia Abroad grew polarized along generational lines, with modernists casting themselves as "young émigré writers."[192] A functional substitute for outmoded "isms," this generational identity disregarded biological age—most of *Chisla*'s contributors were around thirty or older—for the sake of aesthetic and philosophical affinities,

whereas its public articulation drew on the postwar French modernist practice of using the adjective "young" as "a password in which a community of thought and sensibility expresses itself."[193]

Besides scholarly inattention to Russian modernism's life in exile, the issue of its outer temporal limit has been exacerbated by our failure to distinguish modernism as a living cultural community from discreet expressions of its legacy. Supra-individual pursuits were a key ingredient of modernist identities and their basic unifying feature. The attendant ethos of a collective endeavor, as Khodasevich put it in his historical reflections on "new art," was contingent on the existence of a community that, for all its factiousness and heterogeneity, shared an evolving system of values and an institutional structure.[194] It makes eminent methodological sense to differentiate between vestigial manifestations of modernist art and thought in Stalin's USSR, where modernist culture was extinguished by the early 1930s, and the community's continued life in Russia Abroad. The lack of such a distinction explains the inconclusive nature of the evidence cited in support of Russian modernism's variously proposed temporal boundaries. Without that distinction, the messy and counterintuitive Russian literary process becomes truly unreadable for students of modernism.

In 1927, for example, modernists lost their last reliable publisher in the USSR, *Krasnaia nov'*. Concurrently, Lidiia Ginzburg recorded her impression that a literary-historical cycle, with Belyi and Pasternak as its final exponents, had ended. But 1927 also saw the LEF's revival and the birth of the OBERIU, hardly recommending that year as modernism's Styx.[195] Or take 1929, the year of the Stalinist Great Break, when the same issue of a Soviet literary weekly hounded Pil'niak and Zamiatin for publishing abroad and introduced its readers to Joyce's *Ulysses*.[196] Often treated as the year of the coup de grace for free cultural expression in Soviet Russia, 1929 saw a recrudescence of modernist metafiction, explained in scholarship as a defensive reaction to Marxist pressure.[197] That year, a Soviet critic decried the "renaissance of Sologubian bourgeois aestheticism," and an émigré observer struggled to explain the proliferation of artifacts whose modernist pedigree jarred with the ethos of the Cultural Revolution.[198] In 1932, some modernists tried to adapt to the nascent Socialist Realist aesthetic, while others were emboldened by Stalinist reforms that momentarily eased ideological pressure. The resultant flurry of modernist texts was met with critical handwringing in the USSR and puzzlement abroad.[199] But even after modernist practices had been cast as the foil to Socialist Realism, debates about their

value persisted in the Soviet press, framing the publication of translated modernist novels—Céline's *Journey to the End of the Night* in 1934, and Joyce's *Ulysses* in 1935-36.[200] Recurrent anti-modernist campaigns are proof enough that the vestiges of modernism remained a thorn in the side of Marxist ideologues. The most notorious of these crackdowns, launched in the spring of 1936, interrupted the serialization of *Ulysses*, and its aftershocks were still felt in 1937.[201] Yet, in that year of unprecedented political terror, Soviet publishers brought out Joyce's *Dubliners* and a double issue of the scholarly series *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* devoted to early Russian modernism and treating it with minimal Stalinist bias. As late as 1940, "in a weird outburst of relative liberalism" (Malmstad), the writings of proscribed modernists—Akhmatova, Belyi, Sologub, and the like—appeared in book form in the USSR, although Akhmatova's volume was then publicly denounced as an ideological error.[202]

Consequently, in searching for Russian modernism's upper temporal boundary, we must distinguish the culture's continued life abroad from its vestigial expressions in the USSR, where modernism as a community succumbed to ideological and demographic pressures in the early 1930s.[203] The death of modernist culture in Soviet Russia was evident in the concurrent proliferation of memoirs by its veterans (Belyi, Forsh, Livshits, Pasternak, Pertsov, Piast), intent on the mythopoetic codification of their experience. In the 1930s, neither the sporadic residual manifestations of the modernist sensibility—in print or in the proverbial "catacombs," where its carriers, like Kharms or Akhmatova, found their tiny publics—nor the selective cooptation of modernist legacy by the theorists of Socialist Realism prevented veterans of "new art" from experiencing the collapse of their cultural community as personal banishment from the literary process, even if they remained literary professionals.[204] This privately aired sense of exclusion, logical for those reared in the modernist ethos of creative activity as a collective endeavor, resonated with émigré critical discourse, which dismissed the possibility that modernist art could secretly exist in Soviet Russia. "There may be a few unpublished books," wrote Adamovich in 1932, "but I doubt the existence of an entire literature 'in the catacombs.' Literature can only live in public. Its creation and evolution rely [. . .] on a dialogue."[205]

Taking as our basic methodological premise that modernism is a culture and that it is, therefore, contingent on a community linking cultural producers to a public and each other, we can synchronize the end date of Russian modernism with precipitous structural changes in the émigré subsystem of

the Russian field of cultural production between September 1939 and June 1940, when most émigré institutions folded under the effects of wartime economic conditions, mass migration, and Nazi censorship.[206] The Second World War and France's occupation shuttered the interwar space for free Russian cultural life. Iurii Terapiano explained the difference between pre- and postwar Russia Abroad, placing at its center the demise of émigré modernism:

> The antebellum emigration was a miraculously preserved Petersburg in miniature, transplanted to the banks of the Seine. Its poetry was written for a completely different set of readers and listeners who no longer exist, having moved elsewhere or died out. I have always experienced the beginning of the war, in 1939, as the end of this "Petersburg in miniature." Today, only a few surviving individuals from the totality of our "brilliant Montparnasse" roam, like ghosts, among the living: the old emigration is dead. We have no common language with new arrivals [from the USSR], because our *artistic* paths are different [. . .] Ours was a natural, organic continuation of previous cultural tradition, whereas theirs is an attempt to recover and appropriate, after collapse and disruption, various fragments of that shattered whole.[207]

It is noteworthy that Terapiano incorporates readers into his description of the lost culture, echoing the modernist understanding of creative activity as contingent on the existence of a special interpretive community. We find the same view in Vasilii Ianovskii's epistolary eulogy to Russia Abroad. Bemoaning the disintegration of modernist culture in exile, the writer singled out the fact that he was now left with "no publishing venues, no readers [. . .] What a wonderful émigré crowd we used to have: one could express anything—and they would always understand. Where did it all go?"[208]

True, the dissolution of the Russian modernist community during the Second World War did not put an end to its aesthetic and intellectual practices, which kept resurfacing in the work of individual émigrés as they did in the art of modernist veterans in the Soviet Union. Akhmatova wrote the bulk of *Poema bez geroia* in the 1940s. Nabokov saturated his English prose with Russian modernist practices and sensibility. But such vestiges should not be confused with the living culture of Russian modernism, whose outer temporal limit can be justifiably fixed in 1940.

4 Navigating Russia's Cultures of Modernity

Treating modernism as a by-product of the momentous cultural processes sweeping Europe at the time of industrialization and urbanization, Robert Wohl called it a counterculture born in response to "popular cultures and an official hegemonic culture combining aristocratic and bourgeois values left over from earlier centuries and welded by the last third of the nineteenth century into some kind of synthesis that varies from country to country; on the other hand, as the century comes to an end, one begins to glimpse the outlines of a new consumption-oriented mass culture called into being by social and economic change."[1] Since Wohl's model relies on Western examples, it is only partially usable in Russian modernist studies. The empire of the tsars was an agrarian polity with a small urban middle class whose socioeconomic weight began to challenge the power of the nobility and the clergy only by the turn of the century. With no separation of church and state, Russia's official culture fused aristocratic and ecclesiastic values. Yet it was far from hegemonic, since its authority was sapped by the *intelligentsia*. A phenomenon with no foreign equivalents, distinct from the Western middle classes, at least in its initial period (1850s–70s), the intelligentsia recruited its members from all social strata—first and foremost, from the premodern minority cultures of the gentry and the clergy. Chronologically, then, the intelligentsia was Russia's first culture of modernity. Nascent Russian modernism defined itself not only against "the bureaucracy," as Vladimir Veidle retrospectively dubbed the empire's official culture, but in opposition to the intelligentsia as the unofficial yet authoritative arbiter of tastes and ideas in the national field of cultural production.[2]

Most commentators agree on the adversarial nature of the intelligentsia as a cultural formation whose common denominator was not economic or educational but political and ethical. The intelligentsia styled itself in oppo-

sition to the tsarist state. The second point of consensus concerns the intelligentsia's self-sufficiency as a cultural community with its own sensibility, mythology, values, and practices codified and disseminated in print media.[3] It is indicative of their ontological proximity as minority cultures of modernity that the intelligentsia resists definition no less than does modernism. The intelligentsia embodied the proverbial chaos of modernity. On the one hand, it defied the empire's official taxonomy of estates—nobility, clergy, merchants, townspeople, and peasants. The intelligentsia's incompatibility with this premodern vision of society was manifest in the term *raznochintsy*, "people of different ranks," which tsarist officials often applied to self-described *intelligenty*. On the other hand, the intelligentsia posed a taxonomical dilemma to Marxists, who struggled to explicate this déclassé cultural formation with no shared economic basis. The destruction of the intelligentsia culture in the USSR flowed from its conceptual dissonance with the Marxist worldview.[4]

At the century's turn, the intelligentsia was caught between the growing mass culture and the nascent minority cultures of the educated elites, Marxist and modernist. The last two emerged from the intelligentsia's own midst as its "rivals and potential enemies" (Miliukov), contesting their progenitor's self-image as Russia's vanguard and functioning as anti-intelligentsia alternatives for individuals born in the last three decades of the nineteenth century: the average age of Bolshevik leaders in 1917 was 39, while that of modernism's principal actors was not far behind.[5] By charting the historical relations among various formations in the Russian field of cultural production at the time of its rapid structural mutation, from the 1890s to 1940, we open modernist studies to a range of insufficiently explored topics and analytical approaches. In this chapter, I sketch the interpretive potential of such cultural sociology, which could add more than one useful map to our historical atlas of Russian modernism.

The Intelligentsia and the Two Avant-Gardes

Modernism, like its Marxist rival, arose during a crisis in the intelligentsia culture, whose identity and sense of purpose had become obsolete.[6] The social makeup of fin-de-siècle Russia jarred with the intelligentsia's self-image as the defender of "the people" (read, peasants) and the epitome and promulgator of a single national high culture.[7] In 1899, Valerii Briusov voiced amazement that there were people who still thought that way.[8] Industrialization and urbanization had brought diversity and pluralism to Russian society,

belying its division into "the people" and "the educated." Neither element in this Populist schema, rooted in the midcentury agrarian socialist thought dominant in the intelligentsia culture, reflected Russia's professional and educational stratification. This, in turn, cast doubt on the intelligentsia's self-assumptions, stimulating a debate about its future.[9] Punctuating the first three decades of the century, this debate reached new levels of intensity in early Soviet Russia and in Russia Abroad.[10]

The intelligentsia's modernist and Marxist offshoots exploited its identity crisis for the sake of self-legitimation, castigating their progenitor as "degenerate" and "bourgeois." Linked to these mythologemes, the notion of the intelligentsia became a rhetorical weapon with negative connotations.[11] If pioneers of "new art," like Nikolai Minskii and Dmitrii Merezhkovskii, still thought of themselves as part of the intelligentsia, albeit critical of the culture's shortcomings, younger modernists were less conciliatory. Osip Mandel'shtam defined his generation in contrast to those who "enunciated the word '*intelligent*' with pride," and Boris Eikhenbaum invoked "the intelligentsia criticism and intelligentsia science of literature" as foils to Formalist thought.[12] As "people seceding from the intelligentsia majority" (Belyi), modernists claimed the exclusive right to leadership not only in the aesthetic domain but also in ethical, spiritual, social, and intellectual matters.[13] Vying for that coveted vanguardist role both in Russian society at large and within their own culture, modernists often assimilated each other to the intelligentsia bogeyman in the heat of factional quarrels.[14] Similar logic informed the culture of Marxism. If Gorky framed his transition from modernism to Marxism as vanguardist defiance of the intelligentsia's "embourgeoisement," squabbling Marxists—Bolsheviks, Mensheviks, Jan Machajski's worker-focused adepts, God-builders, the Proletkult, the RAPP, and so on—routinely likened each other to the despised intelligentsia.[15] After 1917, modernism's anti-intelligentsia ethos was grist for the Bolshevik mill, but hardly to the extent outlined in Nadezhda Mandel'shtam's conspiracy theory about a modernist-Marxist collusion against the intelligentsia culture.[16]

The intelligentsia's rapport with Marxism and modernism has been described as a process of replacement, whereby the holistic outlook and sensibility of the ailing mother culture are partitioned between its offspring in a kind of division of labor. In this reading of cultural history, Marxism acts as the heir to the intelligentsia's positivist outlook, political vanguardism, and utilitarian treatment of cultural creativity, whereas modernism repudiates positivism and utilitarianism, focusing on aesthetic and metaphysical issues

at the expense of the sociopolitical focus of the intelligentsia's artistic philosophy.[17] Neither Marxism nor modernism receive their due in this oversimplified historical narrative. The culture of Russian Marxism, while dominated by sociopolitical concerns, never excluded matters of artistic and intellectual creativity from its purview. It accommodated, well into the 1920s, a range of aesthetic and philosophical practices, irreducible to Lenin's utilitarianism, which was indeed in keeping with the intelligentsia's traditional values. At times these practices rivaled and at other times overlapped with modernist art and thought. In turn, the culture of Russian modernism, while primarily driven by aesthetic and philosophical concerns, shared the ultimate goal of transnational modernism—"the improvement of human life based on values derived from the artistic culture."[18] Occasionally, this goal facilitated the rapprochement of Russian modernists and Marxists. More often, it pitted the two cultural communities against each other in rival vanguardist claims.

Russian modernism's theurgic impulse to alter reality through art was in sync with the "politics of the spirit" (Bronner) that was a common element in transnational modernism, beginning with the ideas of William Morris and Henry Van de Velde about art as a tool for social transfiguration.[19] True, the "politics of the spirit" were probably more central to Russian modernist culture than to its Western counterparts, hence the self-image of its actors as "artistic revolutionaries rather than European-style aesthetes."[20] However, Russian modernists absorbed and radicalized the intelligentsia's logocentrism, investing the Word with Promethean power that gave verbal artists the ability to create extra-artistic reality. They dismissed the intelligentsia's and Marxism's vanguardist ambitions on the assumption that the ultimate goal of modernist creativity—"the revolution of the spirit"—would transform the human condition more thoroughly than the socioeconomic changes advocated by political activists.[21] Marxists, in turn, claimed the exclusive right to lead "the masses," denying it to their intelligentsia and modernist rivals.[22]

This competition for the vanguardist crown informed Belyi's view of art as a "tactical device" akin to "the dictatorship of the proletariat"—a weapon of universal liberation wielded by modernists as "life's organizers" and "rightful leaders."[23] By this logic, modernists were revolutionaries like Marxists.[24] In 1906, the inaugural issue of *Pereval* opined that "all forward-looking rebels were brothers—be they political fighters or destroyers of narrow bourgeois morality and defenders of creative freedom." Having thus posited the equivalence of "philosophical, aesthetic, and social radicalism," the modern-

ist journal "recognized the usefulness of party work, but rejected party-imposed outlooks" as contrary to its quest for freedom—a view repeating Briusov's recent attack on Lenin's subordination of art to party politics.[25] A decade later, this logic informed a modernist push to dominate the nascent Soviet field of cultural production. The self-described "Bolsheviks in art" and "leaders of the artistic masses" explained their alliance with Marxists ("revolutionaries in life" and "leaders of the people") by a shared desire to destroy the old world. However, modernists insisted on their independence from the party as artistic creators and social reformers.[26] This stance was not an aberration born in the chaotic aftermath of Lenin's coup, for it relied on a long tradition. The same tradition enabled Formalist littérateurs to reconcile radical social aspirations with the advocacy of artistic autonomy, against the grain of Marxist utilitarianism.[27]

Transcendental longing for the "new human being" and "new life" remained among Russian modernism's core values throughout the culture's existence.[28] Even when the ethos of radical renewal receded to the community's periphery in the 1920s (see chapter 3), modernists kept their faith in art's superior ability to revolutionize the human condition. "Although Picasso and Stravinskii are to spiritual life what Lenin and Mussolini are to social life," wrote Georgii Fedotov in 1936, "only they are true instigators and pioneers, because political leaders are intellectually mired in reality's lower strata."[29] This persistent self-image as the social, spiritual, and intellectual vanguard justified modernist factiousness as a revolutionary prerogative. "The worst enemy of a revolution arises from within," wrote Ellis in 1908, castigating the modernist rivals of his *Vesy* faction as "epigones of the revolution." Belyi, his brother-in-arms, found no better label for the *Vesy* circle than "Symbolist Bolsheviks."[30]

With the above corrective in mind, the reading of the intelligentsia's supersession by Marxist and modernist cultures as a division of labor holds much heuristic potential in the context of a homologous analytical model that I call "the two avant-gardes" hypothesis. Pioneered by Raymond Aron, the concept of the two avant-gardes denotes artistic, intellectual, and sociopolitical practices that emerge between the late nineteenth century and the Second World War, sharing in a quest for radical alternatives to liberal capitalist modernity. I find Aron's model preferable to the more recent approach subsuming under the modernist tag all anti-liberal practices in the period concerned, on the grounds of their shared regenerative ethos and mythology (see the introduction). The latter approach denies active agency to mod-

ernist artists and intellectuals, reducing them to the status of fellow travelers in political causes. In contrast, the two avant-gardes hypothesis treats modernist culture as an equal player in a multifaceted rebellion against modernity, in the course of which cultural creators and political activists, despite occasional tactical alliances, compete for the exclusive right to leadership in all spheres of life. This rivalry explains the ultimate suppression of modernism whenever the political avant-garde acceded to power, in Soviet Russia, in Fascist Italy, or in Nazi Germany.[31]

The two avant-gardes hypothesis was first tested on Russian material by Bernice Rosenthal, who spoke about "two concurrent revolutionary processes" unfolding in the country from the century's turn until 1917. Rosenthal contended that the implicit agenda of Russian modernism had rivaled the programs of contemporary radical political movements. Irina Gutkin subsequently refined this schema. Extending the period in question to the early 1930s and reading it through the prism of "the interaction of the two avant-gardes, the Marxist political revolutionaries and the revolutionary artists," Gutkin suggested that, in their drive to transform all spheres of life, modernists and Marxists shared one "intellectual revolutionary paradigm." Nurturing rival utopian aspirations for bringing about an ideal society, they contested each other's vanguardist claims as too idealistic (modernism) or too materialistic (Marxism).[32]

The intelligentsia establishment dismissed both self-styled avant-gardes as pernicious, albeit homologous and complementary, foreign imports, in contrast to the concurrently emergent Socialist Revolutionary (SR) movement, which retained and updated the intelligentsia's traditional Populist coordinates.[33] Until the mid-1900s, confirming their initial perception as joined at the hip, Marxist and modernist communities enjoyed a degree of interconnectedness that puzzled latter-day commentators.[34] Early Marxist culture, furthermore, acted as a purgatory for rebels against the intelligentsia community—N. Berdiaev, S. Bulgakov, S. Frank, P. Struve, and so on—many of whom eventually drifted toward modernism, deeming Marxism insufficiently idealistic.

The porousness of borders between the two avant-gardes peaked in 1905, but its effects were felt throughout the first decade of the twentieth century.[35] To justify his brief editorship of a Bolshevik journal, Minskii cited his earlier conviction that, as "reorganizers of daily life [. . .] Marxists had been the most suitable allies" to "artistic innovators."[36] Following such logic, a future chief of the Soviet secret police, Vatslav Menzhinskii, published

alongside early modernists who looked favorably on his prose.[37] Lenin's future commissar of enlightenment, Anatolii Lunacharskii, wrote plays attuned to modernist drama, partaking in the God-building movement, which strove to create a Marxist metaphysics. Another Bolshevik God-builder, Aleksandr Bogdanov, wrote science fiction romances whose mysticism resonated strongly enough with the modernist sensibility to earn him, decades later, Stalinist censure for straying from "Marxist philosophy into the idealist camp."[38]

In and of itself, opposition to the intelligentsia cannot account for the initial interconnectedness of the two avant-gardes. Nor can it explain the embrace of Lenin's rule by numerous modernists, in contrast to the hostility it encountered among the intelligentsia at large. Marxism and modernism shared other premises facilitating their rapport. Both nurtured the dream of revolutionizing the human condition by freeing it from "bourgeois" modernity: Marxists stressed political and economic transformation, while modernists aspired to "the revolution of the spirit" as a corollary of social change, echoing William Morris's idea of socialism not as an economic system but as a response to the philistinism of modern society. In another overlap, the worldviews and mythologies of many actors in Marxist and modernist cultures drew on the same religious sources and exhibited kindred transcendental striving beyond the daily grind—*byt*—which filled them with quasi-metaphysical dread.[39] These affinities informed Mikhail Prishvin's observation of kinship in such seeming antipodes as Lenin and Ivanov-Razumnik, they led Mark Vishniak to postulate the parallelism of Nikolai Berdiaev's and Lev Trotsky's thought, and they helped Dmitrii Mirskii contextualize Valerii Briusov's career as a Soviet official.[40]

Quoting from Briusov's poetry, Mirskii argued that "he may have been drawn to the Communists thanks to their amoralism [. . .] maximalism [. . .] and cruelty."[41] To the reader of Mirskii's time, the term "maximalism" denoted a quality known in today's historiography as *evolutionary impatience*—the low status of gradual change in the value systems of Russia's minority cultures of modernity, which idealized radical renewal in all aspects of life.[42] Modernist memoirists deplored evolutionary impatience as a factor in Russia's tragic history, blaming the intelligentsia as the purveyor of such spiritual maximalism.[43] Yet, in the fin-de-siècle intelligentsia culture, the cult of radical renewal was already yielding to other values, thanks to the growing professionalization of Russia's educated elites and their resultant embrace of nonconfrontational forms of self-assertion. The intelligentsia's de-radicalization,

palpable in the 1890s, permitted nascent Marxist and modernist cultures to reclaim their progenitor's maximalist legacy as a marker of vanguardism, newly couched in Nietzschean terms. Hence Mirskii's mention of amoralism and cruelty as traits that could have drawn Briusov to the Bolsheviks.

Prior to informing National Socialist and Fascist cultures with the aestheticized vision of reality as material for creative self-expression, Friedrich Nietzsche's ideas permeated Russian modernism and Marxism.[44] The two avant-gardes subscribed to the Nietzschean critique of modernity, embracing the philosopher's dream of a new elite whose will to power and freedom from conventional morality would permit the creative (Apollonian) reordering of the chaotic world cleansed by elemental (Dionysian) violence. Such a "cult of power," to quote Nadezhda Mandel'shtam, and the attendant ethos of creative violence prepared the embrace of Lenin's rule among modernism's "aestheticizing sadists of the revolution," as one contemporary dubbed Belyi, Blok, Esenin, and Maiakovskii.[45] Explaining his post-1917 move to the periphery of Marxist culture as a protest against Lenin's "practical maximalism," which "treated Russia as material for experiments," Gorky the Nietzschean still insisted on the "utility of theoretical maximalism" as a character-building principle.[46] In contrast, a Bolshevik littérateur open to modernist art, Aleksandr Voronskii, blamed the intelligentsia's reluctance to embrace Lenin's rule on the culture's conventional morality, couching his denunciation in Nietzschean terms.[47] Gorky, in fact, was slower than his modernist foes to warm up to the Nietzschean construction of Bolshevik leaders as artist-demiurges. Kornei Chukovskii's diary shows that some modernists (the author, Pasternak, Tynianov) revered Bolshevik officials as "stubborn geniuses" whose plan to "reorder the world" trumped, in the view of their admirers, the wide-scale suffering caused by Marxist social engineering projects.[48]

Reviving the intelligentsia's faded tradition of evolutionary impatience, Marxist and modernist cultures conceived of violence as a basic creative tool. Marxists read social history through the lens of violence: from class struggle as the engine of progress to coercion as a means of building the ideal society. Modernists placed violence at the center of cultural history. "Every new literary school is a revolution akin to the emergence of a new class," wrote Shklovskii in 1921.[49] From its inception, Russian modernist culture promoted "artistic revolution over evolution."[50] Most of its actors went through periods of fascination with and support for creative violence in art, life, or both. Witness the general enthusiasm elicited, repeatedly, among modernists by violent upheavals in 1905, 1914, and 1917, all of which the

cultural community construed as threshold events auguring the tabula rasa renewal of the human condition.[51] In the early years of Lenin's rule, even modernists alien to radical politics were often mesmerized by sociopolitical violence and cheered it as a cleansing tide that freed humanity from "bourgeois" *byt* in the run-up to a more consequential spiritual revolution.[52]

The evolutionary impatience of Russian modernism and Marxism capitalized on their mother culture's debt to Christian millenarianism. Becoming *intelligenty*, scions of clergymen and graduates of parish schools integrated into their positivist outlook secularized religious ideals. Preached but rarely practiced in Russia's ecclesiastic culture, the virtues of transcendence and asceticism informed the intelligentsia's thirst for the sacred amid profane *byt*, whose radical disruption and the concomitant renewal of humanity—secular versions of the eschaton and of God's kingdom on earth—were among the intelligentsia's aspirations, encouraging the self-fashioning of the culture's actors as saint-martyrs devoted to the altruistic and anti-materialist service of the greater good.[53] The Christian filiation of the intelligentsia's utopianism was acknowledged by its modernist heirs, many of whom cast themselves, at some point in their careers, as members of an apocalyptic community.[54] Modernists recognized in Russian Marxism another such community, polemically exposing its obfuscated religious lineage, which broke into the open only once, in the late 1900s, when the God-building heresy, challenging Marxist culture's positivist consensus, called Jesus a Communist and interpreted Marxism as a religious philosophy.[55]

Historians of ideas have outlined Karl Marx's appropriation of Christian eschatology, with George Steiner even calling Marxism a substitute theology in the age of secularism.[56] In Marx's schema, the messianic proletariat, led by the Communist elite, redeemed humanity from its alienated condition, restoring it, after the final revolutionary battle with "bourgeois" evil, to the original (classless) state outside history—an earthly paradise modeled on the millennial kingdom.[57] Similar transcendental millenarianism informed Russian modernism's vision of art as "redeeming and resacralizing the world profaned by capitalism."[58] Bridging philosophical gaps between the two avant-gardes, Nietzsche's prophesy of the coming superman broadened the Marxist schema of redemption to psychological and spiritual domains. Russian modernists and Marxists alike styled themselves as elite communities ("new people") guiding humanity to salvation.[59] And therein lay the source of both cultures' internal feuds—with individual factions claiming exclusive rights to

vanguardist chosenness—and of their mutual attraction and rivalry, which Dmitrii Filosofov described, in 1909, as a "struggle of two religions."[60]

Millenarian sensibility opened the door to radical politics even for modernists who were never drawn to Marxism. Merezhkovskii explained his rapprochement with Socialist Revolutionary terrorists—the last redoubt of the radical intelligentsia—as a "new religious community" with kindred eschatological aspirations.[61] In 1917–18, this milieu, renamed the Left SRs, rallied to the Bolsheviks, drawing modernist sympathizers by its "revolutionary mysticism."[62] Merezhkovskii grafted Nietzsche's anti-Christian thought onto Christian millenarianism, relegating the "idea of interminable 'progress' " to the "middling minds" and adjusting his eschatological aspirations to evolving circumstances. To him, wars, revolutions, and political terror intimated an impending "geological upheaval, an earthquake releasing underground waters" to cleanse Europe in the run-up to its spiritual rebirth.[63] In practice, this meant his endorsement of Mussolini and Hitler over Lenin and Stalin. But modernist millenarianism lent itself to diverse politics. Eikhenbaum rooted for anarchists.[64] Mandel'shtam preferred SR terrorists.[65] Yet their ultimate embrace of the Bolshevik rule heeded the same logic that made Belyi, Blok, Esenin, and other self-styled Scythians cheer what they saw as Lenin's creative violence that wiped clean the slate of "bourgeois" modernity for the "revolution of the spirit" to come.[66]

In the 1920s, the stabilization of the bureaucratic Soviet regime and its concessions to private enterprise were experienced by modernist millenarians as a tragic return of "the Leviathan of statehood" (Ivanov-Razumnik), which "perverted the mystery of revolution" (Eikhenbaum)—a sentiment dramatized and satirized in Iurii Olesha's novel *Envy* (1927).[67] Such frustration of utopian hopes led to a paradigm shift in the value system of modernist culture, pushing evolutionary impatience to its margins. This de-radicalization—a signal trait of late Russian modernism (see chapter 3) echoing similar processes in the fin-de-siècle intelligentsia culture—ran parallel to the trajectory of Russian Marxism. The pragmatic needs of state building and governance made maximalism an equally peripheral value in Marxist culture. In fact, as I discuss below, Russian Marxism succumbed to its own political triumph, ultimately merging with and dissolving in mass culture, no matter how "bourgeois" the latter had always seemed to Marxist utopians.[68] Stalinism, through purges and social engineering, finished the job of de-radicalizing Russian Marxism, whose millenarian master plot became, in the 1930s, a formulaic

excuse for a system of state capitalism rife with the values and lifestyles of consumerist mass culture.[69]

The weakening of links between the two avant-gardes began after the abortive revolution of 1905, which had triggered existential crises in both communities.[70] While Russian modernism's standing in the public sphere improved, Marxism came out of the historical reckoning a net loser. It ceased to be the political doctrine of reference for modernists, who turned to the intelligentsia's radical holdouts—anarchists and SR extremists—as kindred "poets of the revolution" thanks to their cult of violence as "the revolutionary creativity of the masses."[71] At the same time, modernism overshadowed Marxism as a beneficiary of the decline of the intelligentsia culture, whose value system crumbled under the shock of the failed revolution.[72] Before 1905, commerce between the minority cultures of modernity primarily concerned modernists and Marxists as the intelligentsia's pariahs. In the new dynamic, Marxism grew isolated, its Bolshevik core resembling an obscure sect.[73] In contrast, modernist culture expanded because of the influx of cultural producers and consumers from the intelligentsia community—a trend that even sparked speculation about the birth of a new social type, "the aestheticizing *intelligent*" (Anichkov).[74]

Growing interaction between the intelligentsia and modernist cultures—"the most precious fruit of the revolution" (Filosofov)—translated into editorial collaboration and the opening of the intelligentsia press to its former whipping boys.[75] To be sure, the rapprochement had its limits. Take *Vekhi* (Signposts, 1909), a seminal volume of essays by a group of "former nihilists, former *intelligenty*, former Marxists" (Veidle), who attacked core intelligentsia values the way modernists had done for years.[76] *Vekhi* enjoyed a warm reception in the modernist community. It was, then, logical for a *Vekhi* author, Pëtr Struve, to turn over to modernists the literary section of his review, *Russkaia mysl'*.[77] But the experiment faltered when Struve's aesthetic traditionalism and philosophical anti-radicalism clashed with the artistic practices and spiritual maximalism of his new allies, culminating in the editor's refusal to publish Belyi's *Petersburg*.[78]

The modernist community attracted not only the *intelligenty* seeking alternatives to their culture's traditional focus on sociopolitical activism but also those utopians who, like Ivanov-Razumnik, resented the intelligentsia's de-radicalization, embracing the millenarian ethos of modernism.[79] Pace Tynianov, there was little "unnatural" in Ivanov-Razumnik's fusion of SR extremism with the advocacy of modernist art.[80] Such post-1905 rapproche-

ment with the intelligentsia's vestigial radicals stimulated the emergence of the modernist practices Prishvin later called "aestheticizing Populism" (Belyi's *The Silver Dove*, 1909; Remizov's folk stylizations; primitivist painting).[81] Some SR terrorists, in turn, grafted the intelligentsia's utopian tradition onto the modernist sensibility, blurring the lines between political violence and cultural creativity. Boris Savinkov's practice of "life-creation," feted in modernist circles, married terrorism to writing in a single medium for authorial self-fashioning (*Kon´ blednyi* [*The Pale Horse*], 1909).[82] Vladimir Likhtenshtadt, to take another example, drew a rationale for his terrorist activities from Nietzsche's *Zarathustra* and spent jail time translating Otto Weininger's *Sex and Character*, whose 1908 publication was overseen by a pioneer of Russian modernism, Akim Volynskii (Nietzscheanism stood Likhtenshtadt in good stead when he later rallied to the Bolshevik cause).[83]

Modernism's post-1905 public success became Russian Marxism's lasting trauma and a festering wound of its historiography. The main Marxist explanation for modernism's popularity in Russia was the intelligentsia's "degeneration." Articulated in the two-volume essay collection *Literaturnyi raspad* (Literary disintegration, 1908–9), this argument later shaped Soviet criticism, which codified the decade preceding Lenin's coup as the nadir of cultural life, casting modernism as a weapon in the "bourgeois" war against "revolutionary Marxism."[84] Antagonism between the two avant-gardes grew apace with their diverging fortunes.[85] The expansion of the modernist community vindicated its vanguardist pretentions, eliciting shrill Marxist rebuttals.[86] Adding fuel to the fire, the intelligentsia opinion now tended to side with modernists, dismissing their Marxist detractors.[87]

In 1906, Chukovskii still saw as nonsensical the intensifying Marxist attacks on modernism, because both communities partook in "one revolutionary struggle against the bourgeoisie [*meshchanstvo*]."[88] A year later, he decried Gorky's passage into Marxist culture, signaled by the novel *Mat´* (*Mother*, 1907), as the intellectual regression of a formerly promising writer.[89] Berdiaev also cast Gorky's evolution as "spiritual embourgeoisement" (*dukhovnoe meshchanstvo*).[90] In the same year, 1907, Briusov gave up as "futile" all attempts at commerce with Marxists, while Bal'mont confessed his newfound "revulsion for Social Democrats," as Marxists were often called at this time.[91] The recent mutual porousness of the two avant-gardes was now universally decried. Minskii qualified his former collaboration with Bolsheviks as naïve; Chulkov judged the past alliance of "Symbolists and Mensheviks as flippant and equally insulting to Symbolism and to Social Democracy."[92]

The other party to the divorce also ramped up its rhetoric. Georgii Plekhanov castigated, in 1908, "those defenders of proletarian interests who saw brothers-in-arms in these gentlemen [modernists] thanks to their quintessentially bourgeois, romantic hatred of the bourgeoisie."[93] Accordingly, abandoning his liminal position between the two avant-gardes—to which he owed his early success, built on the fusion of Marxism and Nietzscheanism—Gorky barred modernists from his circle of collaborators and turned to the intelligentsia's artistic canon, dear to the likes of Lenin but increasingly unpopular in the literary market.[94] Hence the demise of Gorky's Znanie series and the declining interest in his writings in Russia.[95] From the viewpoint of the political avant-garde, of course, this was no loss at all. Gorky's flagging popularity with the intelligentsia reader, newly captivated by modernism, confirmed the "bourgeois" and "degenerate" nature of Russian Marxism's rival cultures of modernity.[96]

Similar logic informed modernist attacks on Marxism as a relic of the intelligentsia. Mocking the contrived nature of the notion of the proletariat in a predominantly agrarian society, modernists stressed the intellectual homology of Russian Marxism and intelligentsia Populism, whereby the mythologeme of "the proletariat" mechanistically replaced the old fetish of "the people," while carriers of social privilege arrogated the right to think and speak for the unenlightened masses.[97] The proliferation of literary satires spoofing political radicals, Marxists in particular, was a corollary of the intensifying hostility between the two avant-gardes. Texts like Leonid Andreev's "Darkness" ("T'ma," 1907) or Fëdor Sologub's trilogy *Tvorimaia legenda* (*The Created Legend*, 1907–14) infuriated contemporary Marxists and, later, Soviet ideologues who had a hard time forgetting modernist "slander against the liberation movement."[98]

Cultural historians have not taken the full measure of Russian Marxism's efforts to fend off the competing vanguardist claim of modernism, before and after 1917. Such inattention to the two avant-gardes' enduring rivalry springs from the traditional framing of Russian intellectual history in the early twentieth century as a conflict between the Bolsheviks and the intelligentsia. In fact, Marxists of all hues, Bolsheviks included, were at their most vulnerable not in polemical skirmishes with the declining intelligentsia culture but in clashes with modernists, whose critique of Marxist mythology intensified in sync with the frustration of their community's utopian hopes in the 1920s—just when Russian Marxism's "proletarian fiction and fetish" (Berdiaev) became particularly susceptible to demythologizing attacks.[99]

Civil war, political repression, and economic privations pushed industrial workers back to the countryside. By 1921, writes Sheila Fitzpatrick, "the Russian proletariat had disappeared, leaving only its [Marxist] vanguard, like the smile of the Cheshire cat, behind."[100] The resultant semantic fluidity of the proletariat, in whose name the Bolsheviks ruled, made the latter look like power-hungry impostors.[101] In the continuous public debate about the meaning of the proletariat and its terminological derivatives—a debate particularly acrimonious in literary and artistic milieus—the proletariat grew synonymous with Bolsheviks/Communists, denoting political loyalty rather than social background. Neither the main actors in various Marxist artistic factions (Proletkult, the Moscow Association of Proletarian Writers [MAPP], the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers [RAPP], Kuznitsa, etc.) nor Lenin's modernist loyalists (the Left Front of Art [LEF], Constructivists, etc.) had social roots in imperial Russia's small industrial working class. Yet they all appropriated the proletarian marker, refusing it to rivals as part of the power struggle raging in the early Soviet field of cultural production.[102]

When they took power, Marxists repaid their modernist competitors for the humiliation of the previous decade. Writing in 1921, Eikhenbaum traced the growing disillusionment of modernist maximalists not only to the receding likelihood of "the revolution of the spirit" but also to the Marxist dismissal of their ambitions to cultural and social leadership.[103] Indeed, while appreciating modernist support in the first years of their dictatorship, when the intelligentsia was generally hostile to Lenin's rule, the Bolsheviks had no intention of sharing social or cultural authority.[104] Trotsky succinctly formulated the new dynamic, debunking the modernist equation of "literary revolutionaries" to "political revolutionaries," because "the place of art had always been in the supply train of history."[105] From the Bolshevik standpoint, cultural producers could be part of humanity's vanguard only through subordination to the party's agenda.[106]

The scorn was mutual. Chukovskii privately aired his contempt for Trotsky's risibly provincial artistic pretensions.[107] This was one of many modernist rebuttals to triumphant Marxism: by stressing the Bolsheviks' aesthetic backwardness, one deflated their vanguardist claims and exposed their "bourgeois" sensibility.[108] We find such polemics in Blok's "Pushkin speech" (1921), which insisted on poetry's superiority to political power, and in the charismatic self-fashioning of Akhmatova and Mandel'shtam as figures of social authority locked in a tense symbiosis with Soviet rulers.[109] Similar claims to social authority informed Formalist theories—which positioned their au-

thors as "the most qualified interpretive intermediaries between the heights and depths of verbal production" in all types of public discourse (Gorham)—and the Constructivist agenda of leading industrial workers out of their "cultural backwardness," despite the party's exclusive self-appointment as the vanguard of the proletariat.[110]

The conflict of the two avant-gardes also underlay the feud of Marxists from the MAPP/RAPP with the LEF's ex-Futurists. Symptomatically, the kindred structure of both groups' vanguardist claims allowed for their brief alliances against common foes, like the modernist authors writing for *Krasnaia nov'*, a journal run by Trotsky's aesthetically liberal protégé Voronskii.[111] Neither the LEF nor the RAPP survived the onset of Stalinism, which finalized the destruction of the intelligentsia and modernist communities, while purging Marxist culture of its residual maximalists. The uniformization and de-radicalization of cultural life under Stalin led to the replacement of the divisive proletarian marker with the capacious Soviet label, applicable to any artist willing to toe the party line.[112]

In 1931, Iurii Olesha described the intelligentsia as "a culture the builders of the new society had doomed to oblivion."[113] A year later, Stalinist ideologues designated the state's white-collar service class as the *intelligentsia*, albeit with disambiguating qualifiers—toiling (*trudovaia*) and creative (*tvorcheskaia*), the latter with reference to cultural producers. Stalinism thus strove to fulfill Russian Marxism's original project to appropriate the legacy of its progenitor as its authoritative interpreter.[114] Nadezhda Mandel'shtam summed up the project's incongruity, for those privy to Marxism's long war on the intelligentsia, in her account of a parodically condescending announcement at a food store reserved for Stalinist elites, cultural producers included. The notice informed customers that veterans of the intelligentsia terrorist organization People's Will may cut the line: "Narodovol'tsam bez ocheredi."[115]

True, the prestige of vanguardism survived the de-radicalization of Russian Marxism and its fusion with the state-controlled consumerist mass culture, a fusion decried by exiled and foreign Marxists, from Trotsky to Vera Dunham, and by modernist tourists like André Gide as a "compromise with the petty-bourgeoisie" and a "betrayal of the revolution."[116] In contrast, Stalinism was adamant about the radical novelty of its socioeconomic, intellectual, and artistic practices. The vestigial life of Marxism's avant-garde ethos in Stalinist culture was a boon for late modernist subjectivity, whose crystallization in Russia Abroad (see chapter 3) was facilitated by the endur-

ing contest of the two avant-gardes in otherwise unfamiliar circumstances, as émigrés grappled with the demise of Russia's minority cultures of modernity back home and the steady expansion of mass culture in European and Soviet societies alike.

The Two Avant-Gardes and Mass Culture

In the 1890s–1900s, easing censorship, cheaper printing technology, and rising literacy rates accelerated the democratization of Russia's cultural market. The market's evolution boded ill for the intelligentsia, whose authority was challenged not only by its modernist and Marxist offspring but also by booming mass culture. The latter created an interface for cultural consumption where scions of the educated elites met the newly literate in a passion for popular fiction disseminated in cheap print. "It is at once funny and horrifying to see the heroes of our time," mused a spokesman for the intelligentsia establishment in 1910. "Conan Doyle, a trivial boulevard scribbler, is the intellectual guide of today's high school student, young civil servant, sales clerk, and couturiere alike."[117] The boom in commercial literature was a hard pill to swallow for the logocentric intelligentsia, whose traditional market phobia intensified accordingly.[118] Inheriting their progenitor's stance as a proselytizing vanguard privy to ultimate knowledge and values, modernist and Marxist cultures also abhorred the notion of a self-regulated market where the newly literate readers could freely choose their intellectual nourishment. Yet the market phobia of the two avant-gardes and their concomitant rapport with mass culture were riddled with contradictions. Responding to specific circumstances, the two avant-gardes went through periods of openness to the mass consumer and, obversely, of self-isolation from mass culture.

As the intelligentsia's underdogs, nascent modernist and Marxist communities benefited from the growth of the mass cultural market that sapped the intelligentsia's influence in the public sphere.[119] In the 1890s, Gorky's success augured the era of a mass readership whose tastes and interests developed independently from the intelligentsia's canon and institutions.[120] Correlating the rise of mass culture with the intelligentsia's decline, Chukovskii saw modernism's chance to enlarge its public. But he also warned that market success opened "new art" to popularizing mass consumption—a source of modernism's post-1905 crisis.[121] The issue of interrelations between "the elites and the masses" was a bone of contention in all of Russia's minority cultures of modernity. The intelligentsia's self-image as an altruistic

servant of "the people" was deconstructed by *Vekhi* pundits as a rationalization of social privilege by a caste with its own socioeconomic interests.[122] The ensuing debate reinforced suspicions of the intelligentsia's hidden "will to power," since the culture's apologists only rehearsed its tired self-presentation as a moral elite selflessly serving the unenlightened masses.[123] Marxist and modernist critics upheld the charge of the intelligentsia's hidden agenda, not least because their own communities were suspected of similar ulterior motives.[124]

If the intelligentsia justified its vanguardist ambition in moral terms, as a self-sacrifice expiating the original sin of social privilege, modernists and Marxists projected outward—on "the exploiters," "the bourgeoisie," "the philistines"—whatever feelings of guilt they harbored about their background. The same *misrecognition*, as Pierre Bourdieu describes a group's reluctance to own up to its privilege, informed the mutual recriminations of elitism and egotism among the minority cultures of modernity.[125] No one was immune to such recriminations, especially after the monarchy's fall, in February 1917, when cultural elites, assuming the posture of altruism, launched a race for political and socioeconomic advantages that only intensified after Lenin's coup.[126] In the West, the view that the moralizing discourse of cultural elites legitimated a pursuit of material and symbolic goods emerged during the Dreyfus Affair, foreshadowing the *Vekhi* attack on the intelligentsia. This intellectual tradition, dubbed "l'école du soupçon" (Winock), entered the mainstream of European historiography by midcentury.[127] But "the school of suspicion" was mostly absent from Russian historiography until the 1980s, thanks to its taboo status in the USSR, where it was seen as a challenge to the legitimacy of the Bolshevik rule and dubbed *makhaevshchina*—after its early theorist Jan Machajski, who had accused fellow Marxists of pursuing power and prestige at the expense of the proletariat they claimed to represent.[128]

Russian Marxism internalized the intelligentsia's mission to spread downward a single high culture as a tool of social cohesion, marginalizing accordingly those aspiring to a distinctly proletarian culture. But such baggage made for nagging contradictions. The intelligentsia saw its cultural mission as a reconciliation project rooted in the belief that education would unite "the people" with the elites. Contrary to the intelligentsia's unproblematic assumption that the public of its cultural mission was society as a whole, the two avant-gardes deemed irreversible Russia's social fragmentation. Replacing the myth of "the people" with that of "the proletariat," Marxists posited

the radical difference of industrial workers in cultural terms, which they never articulated. Both national and supranational, the proletariat, they argued, would impose its economic interests and cultural values all over the world. As a result, Marxists were torn between their focus on a restricted public, the proletariat, that had to be educated and spearheaded politically, and their proselytizing dream to save the world at large through proletarian messianism. Such universal ambition distinguished the two avant-gardes from the nation-bound outlook of the intelligentsia, since modernism also inscribed itself within a movement beyond Russia's borders and targeting all of humanity.

Once in power, though, Russian Marxists saw their theory crushed by reality. The scarcity of the proletariat in a predominantly peasant country was exacerbated by the revolution's failure to spread abroad. Additional woes arose with the Bolshevik Party's evolution from a small clique into a mass movement.[129] Among other things, traditionally elitist Marxist culture was unready to deal with the pressure of the mass consumer, who multiplied in direct proportion to the Bolshevik push for greater literacy. From the outset, Soviet administrative structures relied heavily on newly and haphazardly educated, upwardly mobile individuals whose cultural vistas were "middlebrow" at best. As a result, the state's official slogans "art for the masses" and "art belongs to the people," ostensibly rooted in the intelligentsia ideal of a unifying high culture, obfuscated a different reality. Early Soviet cultural policies accommodated rather than broadened the horizon of expectations of the recently educated. Then, in the Stalinist 1930s, de-radicalized Marxism merged with mass culture, allowing today's scholars to speak of Socialist Realism as a program of aesthetic and intellectual infantilization catering to the mass consumer.[130]

Paying lip service to the need to "raise the cultural level of the masses," Stalinism substituted the intelligentsia's utopian mission with the pragmatic lowering of the bar to make art "accessible to the millions."[131] The 1932 takeover of the institutional framework mediating art's creation and dissemination was instrumental in this regard, as were the suppression of modernism and of Marxist radicals (RAPP). Adjusting its ideology to the revolution's failure abroad, Stalinism revived the national focus of the intelligentsia's cultural mission and cast itself as the accomplishment of the intelligentsia's dream of building a harmonious society.[132] With Marxist internationalism on the back burner, Stalinists resuscitated the notion of *narod* (the people), now encompassing all Soviet citizens. Informed by the USSR's passage to

socialism as the declared outcome of the first Five Year Plan (1928–32), this unified vision of society overshadowed Marxism's previous focus on proletarian singularity. Ironically, the de-radicalization of Marxist culture spurred conceptual changes—with class consciousness (*klassovost'*) becoming party consciousness (*partiinost'*), and art's proletarian character growing less important than its popular spirit (*narodnost'*)—precisely at the time when industrialization brought the USSR within the coordinates of Marxist theory, producing a large industrial working class.

Russian modernism was similarly torn between contradictory impulses in its relations with mass culture. On the one hand, modernists cultivated a restricted community prizing its difference from society at large.[133] This elitist posture marked all historical stages of Russian modernism, which counterbalanced its limited national appeal by casting itself as part of a transnational movement. If, in Marxist culture, signs of communal appurtenance were social and ideological (convictions qualified one for membership as surely as proletarian origins), markers of belonging in the modernist community were aesthetic and philosophical. Entry into the culture of Russian Marxism, before its expansion in the 1920s, required both mastery of and belief in its political-economic theory, which looked occult to the uninitiated and esoteric to initiated unbelievers. Even industrial workers, if they did not master and embrace that theory, supposedly suffered from "false consciousness" and belonged in Marxism's cultural periphery. Entry into the modernist community was, likewise, contingent on faith and apprenticeship. As Mikhail Gasparov points out, in the modernist aesthetic "the art of reading was as important as the art of writing."[134] The modernist audience had to partake actively in the creative process by mastering a discourse that departed from that of familiar canons.[135] The audience also had to *believe* in modernist theories whose willful esoterism defied the didactic universalism of the intelligentsia's cultural mission.

On the other hand, there is much evidence for Russian modernism's openness to mass culture as a wellspring of artistic forms, a source of financial remuneration, and a target in the Promethean project to transform the human condition through art. In the latter sense, Russian modernism may have been more proselytizing than were its Western counterparts, all of which addressed an audience, first and foremost, in order to produce it. Modernists were conscious of the special effort needed for the reception of their ideas and artifacts, whose limited appeal made conversion to the community's cause a corollary for the dissemination of its messages. But there

is no reason to think that, in Russia, modernist messages targeted a specific socioeconomic group. Marxists, in contrast, focused their proselytizing efforts on a particular group—industrial workers—which they saw as socially predisposed to embrace their messages and to ensure their centrifugal spread. At various historical moments and in different milieus within Marxist culture, such proletarian vanguardist exclusivism coexisted and alternated with sweeping universalism. Similarly, the intensity and prominence of Russian modernism's countervailing drives toward hermeticism and proselytizing varied by period and milieu. Even when disillusionment with "the revolution of the spirit" made elitism the central value of late modernist culture, its aesthetic evolved toward the ideal of artistic simplicity (see chapter 3), implying a desire for a broader audience.

This paradoxical dynamic was present in the earliest modernist pronouncements. In his 1892–93 manifesto, Merezhkovskii decried the commercialization and democratization of Russian cultural life as sources of its plummeting standards. Yet he also called for the creation of an "intellectual aristocracy" that should "capture the mob's attention," albeit "not by catering to its base needs but by sheer artistic genius."[136] A decade later, the same contradictory logic transpired in Viacheslav Ivanov's essays, which postulated the "intrinsic necessity" of a chasm between "the Artist and the mob" but saw the goal of "the theater of the future" and of "genuine Symbolism" in reuniting "the Poet and the mob" in a "common sacerdotal celebration" that was nothing short of "nationally inclusive art" (*vsenarodnoe iskusstvo*).[137] Merezhkovskii's and Ivanov's colleague, Aleksandr Dobroliubov, went further. Grounding his poetic practice in popular art forms (folk songs, incantations, sacred verse), he attempted to integrate physically into peasant culture—a gesture that dramatically raised his status in the modernist community.[138]

During Russian modernism's first crisis, triggered by the popularization of "new art" in the cultural market and the community's attendant expansion, calls for "aristocratic esoterism" and against "excessive accessibility" (Ellis) intensified.[139] Several neophytes were accused of watering down "new art" for mass consumption and were relegated to the modernist periphery (see chapter 2). Russian Marxism exhibited the same obsession with purity in the 1920s, when the culture's expansion, thanks to its political triumph, brought about a crisis reminiscent of modernism's post-1905 travails and was also marked by factiousness and suspicion directed at recent recruits.

Calls for elitist purity within modernist culture ran parallel to the inten-

sified self-marketing of its actors, who saw in the growing popularity of "new art" a chance to enlarge its audience, even at the price of heightened accessibility (often deceptive, as in the cases of Aleksandr Blok and his Acmeist foes).[140] Torn between centrifugal and centripetal trends in their community, modernists justified the quest for a broader readership by the need to convert "the mob" into "the public" of their spiritually transformative art. Authors scoffing at mass culture as the realm of *meshchanstvo* also yearned for a wider audience as a target of their theurgic mission and a source of income (see chapter 5). Blok refused to publish in large-circulation newspapers for fear of commercialism and philistinism.[141] Yet his poetry appropriated the favorite genres—Gypsy and urban romances—of the "petty-bourgeois mob" that he excoriated but that, in his critical reflections, morphed imperceptibly into "the people" as the carrier of "the music of the revolution" audible to those who nurtured the dream of "the revolution of the spirit."[142]

The Cubo-Futurists, to take another example, used the expansion of the modernist community as a tool of factional differentiation. "Well-groomed Symbolists are afraid of looking obscure to the public," wrote Aleksei Kruchenykh in 1913, "but we are happy to do so."[143] Yet they persisted in the modernist practice of making the audience participate in the creative process by confronting it with discursive obscurity and provoking it with aesthetically meaningful (mis)behavior. Like their modernist elders and rivals, Cubo-Futurists basked in the limited accessibility of their art while mining mass culture and its popular sources, urban and peasant alike, for verbal and visual forms. After the Bolshevik coup, fighting for a share of the early Soviet market, Futurists cast their elitist art as mass oriented by virtue of its ability to revolutionize the human psyche. In the 1920s, as this Promethean ethos moved to the periphery of modernist culture, its actors integrated "lowbrow" modes—crime, adventure, suspense, science fiction—in playfully metareflective and deceptively accessible prose. Making a virtue of necessity, this Red Pinkerton fiction, so dubbed by contemporary critics, was both a consumer-oriented strategy of economic survival (see chapter 5) and a continuation of the modernist search for alternatives to the classical novel, newly motivated by Formalist theories about the appropriation of marginal discursive modes as an evolutionary principle of literary history.

Russian experience seconds John Xiros Cooper's conclusion, drawn on Anglophone material, that modernist claims to cultural elitism must be taken with a grain of salt.[144] Marxists zeroed in on Russian modernism's coterie existence and self-image as a new aristocracy, but passed over in silence its

countervailing openness to the mass consumer and to popular art forms.[145] Forged in the 1900s, Marxist polemics against the undemocratic elitism of the rival avant-garde were canonized in Stalinist criticism.[146] Mediated by Western Stalinists like Georg Lukács and Jean-Richard Bloch, and later perpetuated by foreign Marxists like Eric Hobsbawm and Perry Anderson, Russian Marxism's anti-modernist rhetoric became a major, albeit unacknowledged, factor in the Western scholarly elaboration of the lopsided picture of modernism as the ultimate redoubt of the romantic cult of the artist-genius who rejected capitalist modernity and spurned its by-product—the heterogeneous and anonymous mass-cultural consumer.[147] In this schema, modernism's tendency to restrict its audience by raising art's accessibility bar and artificially limiting its dissemination reads as a throwback to old-style aristocratic elitism, in contrast to Marxism's "progressive" agenda of overcoming capitalist modernity by exploiting its contradictions, including cultural democratization, which brings the political avant-garde closer to "the masses."

Among recent expressions of this logic, the most prominent is Andreas Huyssen's Great Divide hypothesis, which elides transnational modernism's proselytizing Promethean aspirations and savvy marketing techniques in order to cast it as an enforcer of strict separation between "high" and "low" cultural spheres.[148] Guided by the Frankfurt school's thought, Huyssen also relies on Peter Bürger's rejuvenation of Marxist anti-modernism in the fraught concept of the "historical avant-garde" (see chapter 2), which Huyssen extents to the Marxist radicals of the Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP). He thus assimilates modernism's dogged enemies, who rejected the notion of artistic autonomy and reduced art to a tool of state propaganda, to the high modernist groups of the 1920s, which opportunistically sided with the Bolsheviks as a destructive force laying the social groundwork for the future transformation of the human condition through art.[149] But this preoccupation of the ex-Futurists and Constructivists of the LEF with art's Promethean power was a local expression of Russian modernism's overarching artistic philosophy.[150] Ignoring historical continuity in the modernist drive to erase the border between art and life, Huyssen reads the perennial ideal of "the revolution of the spirit" as proper only to "the historical avant-garde," which becomes, in his interpretation, a unique attempt at overcoming modernist elitism in "an alternative relationship between high art and mass culture."[151]

The Great Divide hypothesis has been challenged in the new modernist

studies, whose practitioners emphasize modernism's interrelations with mass culture.[152] These scholars argue that, rather than withdraw into old-style aristocratic elitism, modernism endeavored to integrate "high" and "low" cultural spheres, creating an anti-commercial counterculture that affirmed the values and worldviews excluded from sociopolitical modernity while learning marketing techniques from a commercialized and democratized field of cultural production.[153] The complex picture emerging from such studies, grounded in Anglo-American material, suggests that Russian modernism was an instance in the larger, transnational modernist search for a balance between two irreconcilable tendencies. One such tendency, toward fuller artistic autonomy from external, economic or political, pressures stimulated the emergence of coteries in which authors were judged by the inherent qualities of their work rather than market success. Another tendency, toward engagement with the mass consumer for the sake of financial rewards and out of the utopian longing to transform humanity through art, informed the putative "historical avant-garde" as much as it did Russian modernist culture as a whole, linking the latter to the artistic philosophy and praxis of such different authors as John Ruskin, William Morris, W. B. Yeats, Virginia Woolf, and T. S. Eliot.[154] What makes Russian modernist experience unique is its interwar geography. Its parallel existence in the USSR and in the West (see chapter 3) exposed the Russian modernist community to an unusual variety of socioeconomic and political circumstances, making it a testing ground for a number of available scenarios in the divergent fates of national modernist cultures across Europe.

In the USSR, modernism came under pressure from several publics whose aesthetic and intellectual horizon of expectations was pragmatically endorsed by political authorities. The Bolsheviks relied heavily on the cooperation of the newly educated individuals of humble origins who formed the Marxist state's administrative backbone. Before Lenin's coup, this group had been the driving force behind expanding mass culture and a target of derision in the minority cultures of modernity.[155] "Your name is legion," wrote Chukovskii in 1914, mocking the "philistine" outlook of this "semi- and even quarter-intelligentsia [. . .] comprised of all sorts of sales clerks, military cadets, medical technicians, scribes, barbers, telegraph operators, dentists."[156] But despite similar misgivings among Marxist radicals, early Soviet and then Stalinist authorities willy-nilly validated the social ambitions and artistic tastes of the new white-collar service class.[157] Thus, adding to the political pressure on modernist culture, state-sponsored opinion polls decried the

obscurity of modernist art to unprepared audiences.[158] In most such studies, this long-known fact was repackaged as a warning, especially in the context of the Stalinist Cultural Revolution, whose aims included the adjustment of artistic production to the needs of the "toiling masses."[159] In the early 1930s, modernists had to justify publicly the limited accessibility of their artifacts, substituting in the process their traditional vision of art as a language of individual genius with a more "democratic" and professional outlook on creativity as a set of acquirable skills.[160]

Mediated by Marxists claiming to defend the public against elitism, the pressure of mass culture on modernism grew throughout the 1920s, stimulating modernist reflection on the cultural impact of the demographic shifts inherent in Russia's sociopolitical upheaval.[161] Boris Eikhenbaum thus argued that the intelligentsia, modernism's major source of recruits, had vanished as a cultural formation. "We have been Europeanized once more," he wrote, alluding to the intelligentsia's supersession by a white-collar service class with a socio-professional rather than cultural identity and a horizon of expectations akin to that of the Western mass consumer.[162] Symptomatically, if Evgenii Zamiatin still touted, in 1922, such facets of the modernist self-image as spiritual aristocracy and individual genius, Lidiia Ginzburg opined, in 1930, that recent demographic trends had lowered the level of cultural life so much that the modernist contrast of "the poet and the mob" now looked like "an antediluvian romantic posture."[163] Around this time, Mandel'shtam's book of essays, *O poezii* (On poetry, 1928), elicited a mixed reaction of awe and puzzlement among his fans, who were keenly aware that the poet was writing for "a fading readership."[164]

The topic was particularly sensitive for those modernists, like the LEF coterie, who cast their art as proletarian (read, mass oriented), justifying its high accessibility bar by the need to force the public into active coparticipation, which would revolutionize its psyche, creating new human beings for a new society. Concurrently, the LEF and its allies denounced rival modernist practices, old and new, as either too elitist or pandering to the mass consumer.[165] Their competitors responded by highlighting the gap between the LEF's advocacy of "art for the masses" and its hermetic poetics. At the same time, the group's poster boy, Maiakovskii, was singled out as an opportunist watering down his art for mass consumption.[166] But as the 1920s wore on, intra-modernist squabbles took a back seat to the prerogative of self-defense against the Marxist onslaught on "difficult" art.[167] Since such defense was increasingly a losing proposition, it fell to a foreign modernist, Diego

Rivera, to intervene in a 1928 debate about the nature of revolutionary art. The Mexican painter voiced the stock modernist vision of mass-oriented art as an effort at cultivating a public through aesthetic challenge, and he decried the advocacy of nineteenth-century models by Soviet critics who saw the intelligentsia canon as the most suitable for unsophisticated audiences.[168]

Although Rivera's words fell on deaf ears, Russian Marxists had no other solution to the problem of mass-oriented art, at least before the promulgation of Socialist Realism. Having developed no coherent cultural agenda of its own, the political avant-garde was much more reliant than its modernist rival on the logic and rhetoric of the intelligentsia's program of bringing high culture to "the people." Consequently, Marxists had trouble admitting that their slogan, "art for the masses," led to the pragmatic embrace of mass culture. The rare open calls by Marxist intellectuals for the "organized simplification of culture" were treated as heretical by Bolshevik ideologues committed to the intelligentsia's utopian goal of building a harmonious society united by a high culture whose spread was contingent on generalized education.[169]

Hence the recurrent clash of policy and rhetoric in early Soviet Russia. As a Marxist critic, Aleksandr Voronskii castigated modernist elitism. But as the editor of *Krasnaia nov'*, he welcomed modernists whose writings were often lost on the journal's target readership—"students in adult education programs for industrial workers, in military academies, and in party schools."[170] Another case in point was the internecine Marxist feud pitting Proletkult radicals against Bolshevik authorities. A network of educational initiatives, the Proletkult was a worker-focused mass movement promoting a proletarian culture independent from state institutions and conceived as the spiritual bedrock of the ideal society to come. The Proletkult's eclectic agenda, in which the intelligentsia's didactic drive to educate "the people" coexisted with artistic vanguardism, resonated with the modernist sensibility. Thanks to their shared belief in art's regenerative power and the centrality of "the revolution of the spirit" to social change, the Proletkult used modernists as workshop instructors.[171] Rejecting the Proletkult's tentative answer to the problem of mass-oriented art in a Marxist state and smothering the movement, Lenin's party asserted its authority in cultural matters without solving the nagging contradiction between the Bolshevik push for cultural democratization and Marxism's traditional elitism, spiteful of the "bourgeois" mass consumer.

In the 1920s, this contradiction could still be exploited to artistic ends.

Mikhail Zoshchenko balanced the state's ideological pressure with perennial modernist concerns—the semantic instability and expressive inadequacy of language, the subjectivity of the self and the world, the quest for a special audience as a coproducer of art's meaning—by forging a narrative mask that capitalized on the discursive manner and intellectual profile of the social upstart behind the expansion of mass culture in the USSR. Modeling his narrators on the mass consumer sired by Bolshevik social engineering, Zoshchenko enjoyed a diverse audience. On the one hand, his stories met with popular success, emboldening the author's satirical riffs on the tension between Marxist utopian rhetoric and pragmatic Bolshevik policies.[172] As late as 1928, Zoshchenko taunted the RAPP radicals by insisting that his narrative persona adjusted the ideal proletarian writer, prophesied in their critical theory, to the present situation, which Formalist critic Viktor Vinogradov described, with reference to Zoshchenko's stories, as "the leveling of cultural heights and the canonization of middling cultural forms."[173]

On the other hand, Zoshchenko's popularity with the mass reader did not diminish his standing in the modernist community. The author's narrative mask fit in the high modernist exploration of subjective viewpoints and stylistic registers, giving the illusion of oral narration (*skaz*).[174] In this light, Zoshchenko was neither an advocate of "petty-bourgeois" tastes, as Marxists had it, nor a mouthpiece of "the masses," as his working-class readers thought. Instead, he appeared to carry on the revolt against the intelligentsia prose canon, launched by Belyi, Remizov, and Rozanov—a revolt redefining the rapport among the character, the narrator, and the implied author and informing the narrative experiments of modernists in early Soviet Russia, which Dmitrii Mirskii concurrently qualified as akin to James Joyce's project.[175]

Ostensibly, Zoshchenko took pride in his diverse readership, boasting that "critics did not really know where to pigeonhole [him]—in high literature or in that lowly one which did not deserve critical attention."[176] But it is unclear just how deliberate was his dual appeal to the mass reader and to modernist sophisticates. It is clear, however, that Zoshchenko's trajectory defies the writer-versus-the-state model of interpretation.[177] Turning to the nineteenth-century novel as a cure for the ambiguity and subjectivism of modernist writing, Stalinists codified this high cultural canon as mass oriented.[178] Such lip service to the intelligentsia's mission of taking high culture to "the people" obfuscated Socialist Realism's lowering of aesthetic and intellectual standards, as if to confirm Mandel'shtam's 1922 death verdict of the classical novel in the age of mass politics.[179] But unlike his fellow mod-

ernists, who had to recant their artistic sins to gain entry into Stalinist culture, Zoshchenko had every right to claim that his art had been accessible to the mass reader.[180] Zoshchenko's choice to discard his narrative mask, then, may not have been only in response to the ambiguity-intolerant Stalinist aesthetic. After all, the generic fluidity of the psychoanalytic narratives that superseded his earlier method did not fit the Socialist Realist dogma any better. But his fictionalized (self-)studies did echo the quest for sincerity and simplicity proper to the concurrent evolution of late modernist culture throughout Europe (see chapter 3).

Zoshchenko was not the only one to be "captivated by the idea of simplicity in the 1930s," Ginzburg noted, aligning him with Nikolai Zabolotskii and Boris Pasternak as equally disenchanted with the high modernist aesthetic of ostentatious experimentalism and metaliterariness.[181] In the Soviet context, such striving for simplicity looked like an ideological compromise rather than a sign of the evolving modernist sensibility. Symptomatically, Akhmatova and Mandel'shtam read Pasternak's verse collection *Vtoroe rozhdenie* (Second birth, 1931) as political surrender: their own poetic praxis drew closer to high modernist hermeticism in contrast to the Stalinist leveling of literary standards.[182] But Pasternak's trajectory elicited a positive response among émigré modernists who kept pace with the pan-European retreat from the high modernist aesthetic (see chapter 3) and distinguished their newfound ideals of simplicity and sincerity from Socialist Realism's primitivism and infantilism.[183] Incidentally, Pasternak retrospectively lumped his poetry of the 1930s with the rest of his modernist output, finally renouncing the legacy of Russian modernist culture in the 1940s and dramatizing his renunciation in *Doctor Zhivago*, before stating it explicitly in his postwar memoiristic notes and interviews.[184]

In Russia Abroad, modernists tended to conceptualize their situation in the neo-Kantian terms of culture versus civilization, popularized by Oswald Spengler's *The Decline of the West* (1918–22). Identifying with "culture" and echoing the rhetoric of Western modernists, exiles invoked "civilization" as shorthand for the submersion of modernity, in authoritarian and democratic societies alike, by technology-driven consumerist mass culture.[185] But they also saw through the Stalinist appropriation of the intelligentsia's rhetoric of enlightenment.[186] The modernist consensus in Russia Abroad treated Stalinist cultural policies as catering to the mass consumer and cast the Socialist Realist aesthetic as a brainchild of "the semi-intelligentsia" running the Soviet state.[187] Émigré modernists saw no contradiction between their

vocal elitism and professed striving for artistic simplicity, whose appreciation in their writings (as in Pasternak's poetry of the 1930s) required considerable aesthetic sophistication: the folding of modernist culture in the USSR and the rise of Socialist Realism served as fair warnings against the futility of deliberately lowering art's accessibility bar for the sake of ever larger audiences.[188] Symptomatically, in émigré intra-modernist squabbles, the *Chisla* polemicists lambasted their opponents, Nabokov in particular, for allegedly pandering to mass-cultural tastes.[189]

The attitudes of modernists vis-à-vis mass culture were additionally informed by reflection about the role of elites in Russia's sociopolitical catastrophe.[190] While some commentators faulted all of the country's educated classes in equal measure, more partisan positions crystallized in intermittent émigré polemics between exponents of the intelligentsia and modernist cultures, who accused each other of facilitating Lenin's victory and arrogated to themselves the exclusive status of Bolshevism's innocent victims. Modernists were blamed for putting their eschatological hopes in the service of the political avant-garde, the intelligentsia for planting the seeds of Marxist positivism and utilitarianism in Russia. But the debate did break out of the predictable dynamic when former intelligentsia radicals (SRs) rallied to the values of Western liberal democracy.[191] Such "bourgeois" values had few Russian advocates prior to Lenin's coup. Most were professionals drifting away from the intelligentsia and affiliated with the Constitutional Democratic Party, which was roundly despised in the minority cultures of modernity.[192] It took the trauma of revolution and civil war to force the intelligentsia's exiled vestiges into embracing capitalist modernity, warts and all, as the lesser of possible social evils—an acquiescence entailing resignation to cultural democratization and commercialism behind the phenomenon of mass culture.

While the same historical trauma disabused modernists of the impending "revolution of the spirit," their exiled community had very few members professing the values of liberal democracy (e.g., Iurii Fel'zen, Vladimir Nabokov). The proliferation of authoritarian ideologies, the Great Depression, and the growth of consumerist mass culture all reinforced Russian modernism's anti-liberal and anti-democratic legacy.[193] Before the Second World War, most exiled modernists retained the utopian hope for the radical transformation of the human condition, albeit recodifying as the horizon of the ideal what had once seemed like humanity's imminent apocalyptic rebirth. Symptomatically, they drew succor from the musings of Western

modernists about European cultural life, which José Ortega y Gasset and his British counterparts described as a war between "the hostile majority" and "the gifted minority" defending high cultural heritage from the "profound injustice of the assumption that men were actually equal."[194] By the early 1930s, émigré modernists came to understand their most urgent task as a retreat into "cultural catacombs," with the goal of salvaging the values of "the gifted minority" from the encroachment of the philistine mass consumer in the USSR and in the West.[195]

After the war, elements of the aforementioned émigré debate continued to inform scholarly and memoiristic efforts at countering Soviet cultural historiography, which cast Socialist Realism as the final victory of Russian Marxism in its perennial war on "bourgeois degeneration." In this schema, modernism was the nadir of the intelligentsia's surrender to capitalist modernity, which only Marxists could overcome as the country's political, moral, and cultural vanguard: witness the fusion of state bureaucracy and cultural producers in the Stalinist elite sporting the appropriated name "intelligentsia."[196] The myth of the Silver Age, which modernists forged in the same émigré debate, functioned as a mirror inversion of the Soviet narrative. It interpreted Marxism as the nadir of the intelligentsia's decline and cultural Stalinism as a resuscitation project breathing new life into the intelligentsia's bankrupt aesthetic and philosophical canon.[197] Finally, the émigré intelligentsia's position in the debate, while less influential than the myth of the Silver Age, also informed an alternative historiography. It allowed for the reading of cultural Stalinism not as a revival of the intelligentsia canon but as an outcome of the modernist Promethean project that fused aesthetics and politics, granting artists the divine power to change the human condition.[198]

The interpretation of Stalinist culture as, above all, an anti-modernist call to order survived the post-Soviet documentary revolution.[199] But the concurrent erosion of the myth of the Silver Age tipped the balance in favor of those historians who, like the deradicalized émigré intelligentsia, construed continuities between the two avant-gardes as evidence of modernism's contribution to the triumph of Russian Marxism and to the rise of Stalinism.[200] In the 1990s, this analytical model was all the more appealing because it brought Russian scholarship in sync with the trendy Western practice of assimilating modernism to other anti-liberal intellectual currents.[201] This model contextualized Russian modernism within the pan-European revolt against capitalist modernity and the attendant philosophical, artistic, and

political quests for alternative modernities, which condoned violence and coercion.[202] Scholars thus conceptualized Russia's minority cultures of modernity, thanks to their market phobia and resultant hostility to liberal values, as locked in an unacknowledged competition for power and privilege—a race with winners and losers but no innocent victims—and equally blameworthy for Russia's tragic history.[203] Such eagerness to assign blame in the years preceding and following the USSR's collapse is easy to understand, but these ideological passions do more harm than good in today's cultural historiography.

In light of the historical rapport between Russia's minority cultures of modernity sketched out in this chapter, the reading of modernism as an intellectual source of totalitarianism, or their assimilation under one rubric, appears no less reductive and biased than Stalinist historiography or its Silver Age foil. As self-styled spiritual aristocrats, Russian modernists shared with their Western peers an anti-capitalist and anti-democratic ethos. Accordingly, all of them acted, at times, as rivals and, at other times, as allies to Marxist, Fascist, or Nazi cultures that also framed their rebellion against modernity as a rejection of liberal capitalist values.[204] Furthermore, Russia's minority cultures of modernity were not hermetically closed. Their mutual interaction unfolded against the backdrop of mass culture, which both repulsed and attracted the educated elites, always remaining a factor in their self-image.

To my mind, the model of mutual appropriation between the cultures of modernity appears more pertinent than the interpretive paradigm assimilating modernism to Marxism, Nazism, or Fascism. Working on Western material, Thomas Crow has described a cycle of exchange whereby mass culture absorbed elements of modernist art and thought, and modernism adopted "low" cultural forms as artistic material, courting the mass consumer as its potential audience.[205] A similar cycle of exchange resulted from the mutual porousness of Russia's cultures of modernity. After 1905, while recuperating modernist ideas and values, the intelligentsia community retained its distinct, albeit problematic, cultural identity. Russian modernists, in turn, drew on the political theories of their Marxist and intelligentsia rivals as tools for articulating their own eschatological hopes and utopian aspirations. At the same time, modernists appropriated "popular" art forms as material for their "high" art, whereas their theurgic ambition ensured unrelenting attention to the mass consumer as a target of modernist Prometheanism. Finally, Marxists compensated for their lack of a coherent cultural

program by drawing on the ideas of their rivals. Stalinism "appropriated and adapted the imagination" of modernist culture (Gutkin) and of the intelligentsia, using their lexicon, aesthetics, and philosophies as "historically decontextualized building blocks" (Günther).[206]

Exploring Stalinism's rapport with mass culture, Evgenii Dobrenko sees in Socialist Realism not de-radicalized Marxism's pragmatic embrace of the mass consumer, as I argue above, but a reluctant compromise, whereby historical circumstances forced Russian Marxists to navigate "the strait between the Scylla of 'mass literature' and the Charybdis of 'elite literature.' "[207] Be that as it may, making sense of the Russian field of cultural production from the turn of the century to the Second World War is indeed an exercise in navigating Russia's cultures of modernity, whose continuously evolving relationship cannot be charted in a single map, whether featuring a strait between the Scylla of mass literature and the Charybdis of elite literature (Dobrenko) or a continent split in two by a Great Divide between high and low cultures (Huyssen). The task, in fact, requires an atlas-like series of maps, because Russian cultural life in the period concerned looks like an archipelago composed of shape-shifting islands—Russia's minority cultures of the educated elites, modern and premodern—in the sea of mass culture.

In 1919, at the height of his eschatological enthusiasm for the collapse of the old social order in Russia, Aleksandr Blok depicted the dynamic between "the civilized world" and mass culture as a continent increasingly submerged by a mighty tide, with only some islands of civilization still remaining above water.[208] Continuing with Blok's metaphor, each map in our atlas would then reflect the state of the islands at a given historical moment. The cultures of the aristocracy, the clergy, and the intelligentsia gradually shrink, albeit at varying speeds. The modernist and Marxist communities periodically expand or contract, in tune with their changing historical circumstances. Finally, a diachronic comparison of all the maps would show the inexorable rise of sea levels which, in the 1930s, leave visible the tips of just two islands yet to be engulfed by mass culture—the Russian intelligentsia and modernist communities in European exile.

5 Russian Modernism in the Cultural Market

Students of modernism trace its economic origins to the shift in cultural production and consumption that became manifest around the time of the French Revolution and spread in step with modernity's impact on European societies. Among other things, this shift entailed the decline of the old system of patronage and of two traditional models of the artist—a self-sufficient amateur-aristocrat and a subsidized professional. The concomitant recoding of art's unrestrained commercial circulation, once deemed profane but now seen as conducive to greater aesthetic and intellectual integrity, made direct remuneration for creative endeavors an acceptable alternative to patronage. In France, the housing and financing of writers by individual or institutional patrons yielded to the "economics of modern literature" (Graña) in the 1830s. In Russia, the commercial literary market arose two decades later, but handwringing about its emergence began in Pushkin's day.

Trading a specific patron and a defined audience for an anonymous and diverse public, writers enjoyed more creative freedom, but their autonomy came at a price. As free agents in a capitalist marketplace, they now competed for the paying public's attention. Winners were handsomely rewarded: the lucrative side of writing became especially obvious with the advent of the royalty system and of mass-circulation periodicals. Losers contended with the uncertainties of a free market where public success and attendant economic benefits were not correlated with aesthetic and intellectual quality. The resultant tension between art as a gainful occupation and its exalted, romantic vision as a divinely inspired calling stimulated awareness of commercial venality as the flip side of artistic autonomy and a threat to its existence, since the precariousness of cultural producers drove them to compromise with the paying public, recalling a sponsored artist's humiliating dependence on patrons.[1]

Today, modernism is often described as a reaction to mercantilism—a circling of the wagons around the values threatened by free-market forces. There is ample Russian material to support this view. Already in 1892, Dmitrii Merezhkovskii identified the commodification of Russian literature as a factor in its decline.[2] True, Russian modernism's self-image as an antimaterialistic community echoed that of its Western counterparts.[3] But it also derived from the general market phobia among Russia's educated elites. Mutual accusations of mercantilism were par for the course in clashes between modernists and their intelligentsia and Marxist rivals.[4] Ultimately, Soviet historiography codified modernism as a venal agent of capitalism. Exported abroad, this narrative infused Western studies of modernism's economic life with ideological bias, casting modernism as a vestige of older concepts of creativity, aristocratic or romantic. The former schema, elaborated by Perry Anderson, conceived of modernism as an oppositional community that both spurned the market as an organizing principle of society and exploited it by posing as the heir to the aristocracy in order to reap socioeconomic benefits from the enduring prestige of high culture in a mass-consumer society.[5] In the second scenario, sketched by Pierre Bourdieu, modernists transformed the romantic myth of art as an expression of individual genius into a tool for the lucrative manipulation of the market of symbolic goods.[6]

In recent years, the new modernist studies have separated the productive elements of these analyses from Marxist ideological chaff. John Xiros Cooper treats modernist circles as "the social places where an unrestrained market society first began to reveal itself" and posits the modernist sensibility and practices as intrinsic to societies organized around the activities of exchange.[7] Lawrence Rainey models modernism as an "unprecedented space for cultural production" that neither opposes nor embraces the mercantilism of mass culture. Modernism, Rainey contends, endeavors "to reconstruct an aristocracy [. . .] within the world of the commodity" by temporarily exempting art from "the exigencies of immediate consumption prevalent within the larger cultural economy" and integrating it into a parallel economy wherein patron-investors, who replace the patron-*salonniers* of old, treat modernist artifacts as rarities of sustaining value.[8] Thomas Strychacz explores yet another modernist valuation strategy, the convergence of creative activity with scholarship and criticism. This mutually legitimating commerce, he argues, helped modernist artists amass cultural authority while bestowing on their interpreters the prestige of high culture and con-

comitant socioeconomic rewards.[9] Finally, Mary Gluck casts doubt on the stock claim that modernism flees from history, contesting its representations as "an alternative culture embodying values left out of social modernity" and "a space where the artist's autonomy in the capitalist marketplace could be protected." Instead, Gluck argues, modernism represents a "radically new cultural practice and artistic identity" actively engaged with modernity in all its socioeconomic guises.[10]

Russian modernist studies have eschewed similar inquiries, whose proximity with Marxist critical discourse has too much negative resonance for those privy to Soviet experience. But even when it is ostensibly free from ideological bias, as in the examples above, cultural sociology collides with the traditional construction of Russian authorship as a charismatic institution whereby writers are imagined in the categories of prophecy and martyrdom. This mythology, born in the nineteenth century and central to the culture of the intelligentsia, was utilized by modernists to the ends of self-fashioning. It has also forced scholars to downplay major aspects of literary life—competition, remuneration, marketing, professionalism—as conflicting with the sacrosanct aura of Russian authorship. Pragmatic sociological inquiries into Russian literary history are, therefore, few and far between. Furthermore, extant studies rarely venture into modernist territory, no doubt because Soviet cultural policies gave Russian modernism a patina of martyrdom, willy-nilly upholding its charismatic self-image and stimulating the reading of its legacy through a heroic prism that, before the 1990s, had the benefit of dissidence vis-à-vis Soviet historiography. As Abram Reitblat points out, the heuristic potential of sociological analysis remains untapped in Russian modernist studies.[11]

Ironically, members of the modernist community were the first to stress the importance of reflection on the socioeconomic aspects of cultural production and consumption. In a 1930 chat with Lidiia Ginzburg, Kornei Chukovskii reviewed his professional strategies: before Lenin's coup, when the market was rife with promises of "money and fame"; in the 1920s, when the censorious Marxist state coexisted with limited private enterprise; and in the Stalinist cultural economy, which forced modernists to reinvent themselves yet again.[12] Continuous adaptation to the evolving market stimulated Chukovskii's interest in literary sociology, such as the cross-pollination of cultural and economic modernity in Nikolai Nekrasov's poetry.[13] The changing field of cultural production similarly forced the Formalists to embrace sociology, which they had hitherto spurned in favor of immanent textual

analysis. Boris Eikhenbaum saw this sociological turn as "imposed by modernity," which "replaced the question, 'How to write?' with another question, 'How to be a writer?' "[14]

There are many methodological benefits to mapping Russian modernism as a social place shaped by market logic. A closer look at market practices could help us distinguish between modernist culture and its rivals in Russia (see chapter 4), despite their shared market phobia and penchant for charismatic authorship. The same approach could reveal gaps between Russian modernist experience and its foreign counterparts. Finally, the economic filter might yield an alternative story of Russian modernism, adding a useful map to the historical atlas of its "misty lands" (Blok). A fuller inquiry into Russian modernism's economic life is beyond the scope of this chapter. I follow here just one thread in the hope of illustrating the heuristic potential of exploring modernism in its evolving economic context. The story line I trace concerns the relationship of the cultural market and the charismatic institution of authorship. The resultant map will focus on the sinuous negotiation—cutting across the chronology and geography of Russian modernist culture—between charismatic authorship and alternative models of creative activity imposed by historical circumstances. This chart also tracks overlaps and divergences between the construction of Russian literary authorship as a quest for secular sainthood and transnational modernism's account of cultural creativity as a form of resistance to commercialism and mercantile exchange.

Cultural historians explain the birth of the charismatic model of authorship in Russia as a by-product of secularization transferring to writers the authority of theologians and monastic scribes as carriers of the divine Word. Dominant in the intelligentsia culture, the charismatic authorial ideal cast writers as moral and spiritual teachers, sociopolitical prophets, as well as martyrs speaking truth to power and aspiring to Christlike self-sacrifice in the service of greater good.[15] A homologous model of authorship existed in European romantic cultures. In the 1820s–30s, Western artists reacted to the growing economic weight of the fickle and impersonal public by conceptualizing creative activity in terms of its inherent value, free from market logic. The romantic authorial model vested the creation of artifacts with heroic implications—as a self-effacing exploit in the service of higher values and despite "bourgeois" economic pressure.[16] The denunciation of the anonymous public as the source of the artist's suffering became commonplace in the self-conception of European authors, not least because the romantic

notion of the artist as a uniquely qualified intermediary between physical and spiritual realms proved effective both as a marketing tool and as a psychological mechanism for coping with the challenges of modernity.[17]

The romantic model of authorship was reenergized by Western modernists, whose critical discourse resonated all the more strongly with their Russian counterparts, primed by the intelligentsia's idea of what constituted a proper writer. Breathing new life into the cult of the creative personality and its self-sacrificial calling, Russians went further than their foreign peers in replacing the romantic withdrawal from the mundane with the programmatic merger of life and art, meant to transform the human condition by bringing about "the revolution of the spirit." Such radicalism may have been due to the origins of Russian modernism in the intelligentsia culture with its charismatic belief in the writer's supreme authority in ethical, spiritual, and social matters. Thus, invoked by Russian modernists, the heroic model of writing was informed by two contexts at once—the intelligentsia tradition of charismatic authorship and the romantic tradition recovered by transnational modernist culture.

The romantic myth of the suffering artist coexisted uneasily with the professionalization of European writers. Contempt for money was a defining feature of "serious" art. Gustave Flaubert earned his living by the pen but insisted that he did not write for a broad audience. Doing otherwise would have sapped the value of his oeuvre, which, he claimed, could be fully appreciated only by fellow artists. Modernists, likewise, encoded popularity as a sign of artistic compromise, while aspiring to capitalize on their art as a source of income.[18] To this end, they devised various market strategies, negotiating—through critical reflection on the taboo mercantile side of creative activity—the impact of the economic prerogative on charismatic authorship, which remained central to their value systems.[19]

The Economics of Russian Cultural Modernity

While literacy rose in the Russian Empire from 21 percent in 1897 to 40 percent in 1913, the upsurge was limited to urban areas and was not accompanied by a similar increase in general education. Only 5 percent of the literate had attended a secondary school. Jeffrey Brooks sees therein the reason for the fin-de-siècle boom in mass-circulation periodicals and serial pulp fiction targeting the 95 percent of readers whose aesthetic and intellectual horizons differed from those of the educated elites. Attracting a better-educated public as well, periodical literature created an inclusive mass-cultural space

confounding social divisions. In 1908, Chukovskii placed side by side statistics for the detective fiction published in May alone (622,300 book copies) and those for *Crime and Punishment*'s 1876 edition, whose 2,000 copies had taken five years to sell at the summit of Dostoevsky's fame. "Compare these figures," the critic pleaded, "and you will see that I am talking about a [mass-cultural] flood."[20] Easing censorship facilitated the growth of popular print, especially after 1905.[21] All this stimulated market demand for writers, increasing literature's professionalization and democratization. According to Abram Reitblat, between 1895 and 1914 the number of authors writing for large-circulation dailies and weeklies rose from 830 to 1,150 (30 percent), while the share of those making a living by the pen grew from 30 to 43 percent, in inverse proportion to the share of aristocrats among Russian littérateurs (67.7 percent in 1880 vs. 41 percent in 1914).[22]

The multiplication of paying readers spelled out unprecedented economic rewards. True, the commercialization of cultural life was old news in Russia. The careers of authors as different as Chekhov, Dostoevsky, and Nekrasov had been shaped by economic considerations and framed by reflection on the role of money in society.[23] But even by the standards of the 1880s–90s, when an honorarium more than 200 rubles per printer's sheet (about sixteen printed pages) had seemed exceptional, the market of the 1900s looked like a new El Dorado.[24] Between 1899 and 1905, Aleksandr Kuprin's honoraria rose from 100 to 1,000 rubles per printer's sheet, and he was far from alone among the writers whose prose was relatively accessible to the mass reader by virtue of sticking to the intelligentsia canon. By Reitblat's count, in the 1900s, 435 littérateurs—fiction writers, critics, and journalists—earned more than 1,000 rubles a month; and those who grew famous (Leonid Andreev, Maxim Gorky, Vlas Doroshevich) made three times as much. Concurrently, village teachers earned 300–500 rubles a month; a pharmacist's pay ranged between 700 and 1,000; secondary school teachers took home between 900 and 2,500 monthly; engineers between 1,000 and 3,000.[25]

The rising economic fortunes of littérateurs made Russia's market-phobic educated elites uneasy. In 1893, rebutting modernist attacks on the intelligentsia, Nikolai Mikhailovskii nixed Merezhkovskii's claim that Russian writers worshipped "the Moloch of capitalism." In his view, only Western authors did so.[26] A decade later, the Populist critic no longer denied Russian literature's commercialization, singling out Gorky, whom he considered a modernist, for scapegoating. He ascribed Gorky's exceptional sales to the

combination of a middling talent with a manipulative thematic range targeting every reading stratum, from the highly educated to the "recently illiterate masses."[27] Gorky, to be sure, played down his financial success. Subscribing to the charismatic authorial ideal and depicting his detractors as profiteers, he told Andreev that, "in Russia, the writer must stay a sacred figure."[28] Such rhetoric did not jar, in Gorky's mind, with pragmatic steps ensuring his personal economic security and the profitability of his publishing ventures.[29]

For Russian modernists, the topic of mercantilism had a particularly partisan ring because the booming cultural market mostly benefited the practitioners of the intelligentsia canon.[30] This allowed modernists to treat the artifacts coming from the intelligentsia and Marxist milieus (including Gorky's Znanie) as facets of commercial mass culture. In 1907, Chukovskii spoke of living in "the newspaper period of Russian literature," which had grown "industrial" and "speculative." Of plebeian origins himself, Chukovskii saw the democratization of literary production and consumption as a downside of modernity. Literature, he thought, had been overrun by "scum." The venal motives of many authors were far from the traditional ideal of the writer-prophet, whose erosion, argued the modernist critic, signaled the intelligentsia's demise as a cultural formation.[31]

In 1914, Nikolai Gumilev echoed this diagnosis, positing that "Russian society had split into the people of the book and the people of the newspaper." The first clung to high-cultural values and, like Romans during barbarian invasions, faced extinction from "the people of the newspaper," whose mass-cultural values had already breached the walls of the modernist community, as in the case of the best-selling Ego-Futurist Igor' Severianin.[32] In this context, some modernists aspired to the "end of literature" (see chapter 3) as a remedy for the commercial profanation of a once-sacred discourse. In 1915, Vasilii Rozanov thus hailed the "demise of literature," seeing therein a symptom of European civilization's decline under the impact of mass culture, whose manifestations ranged, in his view, from parliamentary democracy to modern publishing practices, wherein newspapers had overshadowed books.[33]

It would be a mistake, however, to take such anti-mercantile rhetoric at face value. Modernists combined uncommercial self-stylization with the pursuit of a wider audience and a search for marketing strategies that could secure their personal welfare and the economic success of their collective ventures. As Valerii Briusov complained to Viacheslav Ivanov, "I see no point in editing a journal with no readers, forever limited to 500 subscribers, even

if I get 100 rubles for my editorial trouble in *Vesy*."[34] The two questions—readership and remuneration—were connected at the hip, so that Briusov, playing mentor to a young poet, treated as infantile the acolyte's view of remuneration as irrelevant to the value of art.[35]

Incidentally, for all his railing against the transformation of literary life into a stock exchange, Chukovskii made a living as a newspaper pundit and a protégé of Vlas Doroshevich, the king of Russian feuilletonists.[36] Merezhkovskii and Zinaida Gippius encouraged his pragmatic move to Doroshevich's paper, *Russkoe slovo*, whose first advance (500 rubles) erased the modernist critic's qualms.[37] Akim Volynskii excoriated the materialism of modern cultural life. Beginning in 1916, he also edited the critical section of *Birzhevye vedomosti* (the Stock-exchange news), recruiting as contributors the "who's who" of Russian modernism—Bal'mont, Blok, Briusov, Gumilev, Kuzmin, Minskii, the Merezhkovskiis, Voloshin, Vengerova—all of them self-professed foes of the free-market principles promoted by the daily.[38] Briusov, while editing the elitist *Vesy*, tried to negotiate a lucrative deal with the newspaper *Golos Moskvy*. Negotiations failed, because his demands were deemed excessive: he wanted a weekly literary supplement to the newspaper, edited by himself, Belyi, Blok, and Sologub, who would receive a monthly stipend of 100 rubles, whether or not they published anything, and a guarantee that each would be allowed to publish enough to earn 200 rubles a month.[39] Rozanov, for his part, earned 20,000 rubles in the newspaper *Zemshchina* for a series of sensationalist articles endorsing the ritual murder accusation against Jews during the 1913 Beilis trial.[40] In 1915, Merezhkovskii and Gippius launched a short-lived illustrated weekly broadcasting the modernist message to the larger paying public.[41] In sum, actors in modernist culture castigated commercialism but rarely missed an opportunity to reap the financial benefits proffered by the despised popular press and its target audience.

One must, then, qualify Brooks's insistence, probably inspired by Andreas Huyssen's Great Divide theory (see chapter 4), that Russian modernists created "a special literature for an educated elite," whereas the intelligentsia, ever so loyal to the ethos of bringing high culture to "the people," was caught in the middle of the confrontation between modernist elitism and mass culture.[42] Reitblat proposes a more nuanced picture, identifying three stages in the modernist community's interaction with the market before the Bolshevik coup. In the 1890s, when the intelligentsia still dominated literary life, modernists were barred from most publishing venues catering to Russia's educated elites. Their options ranged from self-financed books and mis-

cellanies to journals like *Severnyi vestnik* (1891–98) and *Mir iskusstva* (1898–1904). Volynskii's *Severnyi vestnik* welcomed modernists but rejected many submissions as too "decadent," while *Mir iskusstva*, although less censorious, rarely printed literary fiction. As a result, early modernists set aside elitist misgivings about the popular press, pragmatically turning to illustrated weeklies, which did not rigidly enforce the intelligentsia canon.[43]

In the second stage, in the early 1900s, Russian modernist culture created a network of publishing houses (Skorpion, Grif) and periodicals (*Severnye tsvety*, 1901–4; *Grif*, 1903–5; *Novyi put'*, 1903–4; *Vesy*, 1904–9; *Voprosy zhizni*, 1905) that provided a measure of independence from the market but had a narrow readership. *Vesy* never exceeded six hundred subscribers; *Novyi put'* peaked at two thousand. A modernist book typically sold a few hundred copies, in contrast to tens of thousands sold by the practitioners of the intelligentsia canon.[44] As a result, unprofitable modernist publishing had to rely on the patronage of wealthy individuals (Sergei Poliakov, Mikhail Tereschenko, Nikolai Riabushinskii) or families (the Filipovs, the Morozovs).[45] Honoraria and royalties paid in the modernist community were small, compared to what one earned with mainstream publishers. Skorpion offered 10–15 rubles per printer's sheet, and royalties from its books rarely exceeded 200 rubles. Modernists could not subsist on proceeds from their literary oeuvre and relied on a combination of sources: family fortunes; editorial work; journalism, criticism, and book reviews; translation; grants from publishers and writers' associations; and secondary school teaching (Annenskii, Vl. Gippius, Kursinskii, Sologub).[46]

In the third phase of Russian modernism's relations with the capitalist market, the post-1905 appeal of the community's sensibility and aesthetics lifted barriers between "new art" and mainstream publishers. Symptomatic of this shift were two events: the demise of Gorky's once-profitable Znanie venture, whose reliance on the intelligentsia canon became its financial undoing; and the birth of boldly commercial enterprises, like the *Shipovnik* almanacs, which ignored the fault lines of literary life, placing under one cover heterogenous writers whose partisan qualms *Shipovnik* assuaged with lavish pay (450 rubles per printer's sheet vs. 300 in the already generous Znanie).[47] The evolving market did not relieve the dire straits of modernist publishers (Sirin, Musaget, Ory, Al'tsiona) and periodicals (*Fakely*, 1906–8, *Pereval*, 1906–7, *Zolotoe runo*, 1906–9, *Apollon*, 1909–17, *Trudy i dni*, 1912–16, etc.)—which never modified their anti-commercial stance.[48] *Trudy i dni*, Khodasevich joked, "had more editors than readers": the journal's roster of

subscribers included 106 individuals and 17 institutions.[49] But the modernist community's economically struggling print did retain its prestige over the intelligentsia's "thick journals" and the mass-circulation press, echoing the dynamic described by Ezra Pound in the Anglo-American context: "The principle of the free magazine or the impractical or fugitive magazine [. . .] attained its recognized right to exist by reason of work performed. The work of writers who had emerged in or via such magazines outweighed in permanent value the work of the writers who had not emerged in this manner. The history of contemporary letters had, to a very manifest extent, been written in such magazines. The commercial magazines had been content [. . .] to take derivative products ten or twenty years after the germ had appeared in the free magazines."[50] Accordingly, Russian modernists juggled the considerations of prestige with the market's economic pressure. In the post-1905 environment, they could offset the financial disadvantages inherent in their culture's coterie existence by writing in elitist and popular venues at once. Such bifurcation helped modernists reconcile their anti-commercial ethos and charismatic self-image with new opportunities for broadening their audience and profiting from the booming cultural market.[51]

Consider their rapprochement with the daily *Russkoe slovo*. The paper's publisher, Ivan Sytin, scorned contemporary literature. But, viewing new fiction as a hot commodity that could attract readers, Sytin courted writers of all aesthetic persuasions, offering monthly salaries and higher honoraria than they earned from books.[52] Modernist responses to the financial windfall followed market-savvy strategies of self-justification. While some, like Belyi, claimed to rally to *Russkoe slovo* for tactical reasons—taking "the revolution of the spirit" to the masses—most modernists contented themselves with a division of labor, saving select texts for more exclusive venues.[53] Boarding Sytin's gravy train, Merezhkovskii made exorbitant demands. He settled for a monthly salary of 500 rubles per one thousand print lines and a book contract for his wife, Z. Gippius, which Sytin decried as "a waste of money." At the same time, Merezhkovskii's attacks on the commodification and democratization of cultural life intensified, as if to compensate for his marketplace dealings. But the writer's most outspoken essays on the topic —"Chekhov and Gorky" and "The Coming Boor"—appeared in modernist reviews. It is unclear whether *Russkoe slovo* rejected the essays or Merezhkovskii did not care to publish them in that den of mass-cultural "boorishness."[54] The first scenario is as likely as the second. Witness Pëtr Struve's rejection of Belyi's *Petersburg*, which Struve had commissioned for his thick

journal, *Russkaia mysl'*, circumspectly withholding payment until the novel's submission.[55]

Merezhkovkii's two-pronged strategy was as common among Russian modernists as it was in the experience of their foreign peers. Take Joseph Conrad's bifurcated output, now targeting the narrow coterie of modernist sophisticates, now the widest possible paying readership. Along similar lines, for the first fifteen years of her career, Virginia Woolf's journalistic work offset the meager proceeds (about twenty pounds annually) from her literary fiction.[56] Aleksandr Blok, who succumbed to Sytin's siren call in 1911, castigated newspapers as conduits of mass culture. Yet he saw the popular press as a source of "honest 'literary' income" that did not harm his place in the modernist community.[57] Belyi, lacking Blok's family fortune, was even more amenable to writing in newspapers—excessively so, in the opinion of his modernist colleagues.[58] But when a conflict threatened his place in *Vesy*, Belyi read the situation as a plot to eject him from the "spiritual aristocracy" (*aristokratizm dukha*) into the "spiritual bourgeoisie" (*meshchanstvo dukha*). Losing his modernist publishing venue, he would have become "just a feuilletonist" for *Russkoe slovo*, contrary to the ideal of the "wise artist," as Belyi himself put it.[59]

In a further threat to charismatic authorship, the economics of cultural modernity transformed the personae of writers into market commodities as the popular media turned literary success into stardom. This happened to Gorky, whose renown owed much to his self-stylization as a social upstart.[60] Another case in point was Andreev, whose fame attracted such extensive journalistic coverage that Chukovskii dismissively dubbed him "the fairy-tale prince of our street."[61] Despite the best efforts of modernists to distance themselves from such notorious cases of public stardom, the post-1905 market tarnished with commercialism core aspects of their sensibility. Among other things, it transformed the programmatic modernist conflation of life and art, and the attendant aestheticizing of everyday behavior, into goods sold to the public in the form of invasive journalistic scrutiny into the lifestyles of cultural producers.[62]

Modernists, to be sure, instrumentalized this dynamic through a two-pronged strategy evocative of their aforementioned publishing hierarchy. Osip Mandel'shtam interpreted the most mundane events in his life as elements of a heroic biography-in-the-making incumbent upon a poet-prophet. Simultaneously, he mined the marketing potential of his renown. A friend reports that Mandel'shtam once picked a volume by Blok, wrote an annota-

tion in a margin, and "proudly" told her to sell the book whose value had just risen to 50 rubles. Such pragmatism coexisted with the poet's posture of everyday impracticality that buttressed the anti-materialist ethos of his charismatic self-stylization.[63] Anna Akhmatova's public persona also cut two ways. On the one hand, her "system of theatrical gestures" enjoyed an attentive modernist audience.[64] On the other hand, as Alexander Zholkovsky observes in his study of "Akhmatova's theatrical abilities," she was "in tune with the twentieth-century democratization of culture and advent of mass-media manipulation of the wider public," so much so that her "emplotting of poetry and life" functioned both as meaningful behavior inside modernist culture and as a tool of wider self-promotion.[65] Marketing by means of self-stylization was accepted in the modernist community for as long as it followed an implicit hierarchy of audiences. Marina Tsvetaeva condoned Vladimir Maiakovskii's public success, because "he knew his own true worth" among fellow poets. His "fame was good advertisement for monetary purposes," Tsvetaeva opined. "When Maiakovskii needs money, he creates yet another sensation [. . .] The public rushes to watch the scandal and brings its money along."[66]

Hierarchical differentiation among audiences upheld the modernist community's charismatic ideal. Eager to make a living by the pen, yet loath to resemble professional littérateurs, modernists struggled to rationalize the post-1905 popularization of their sensibility and aesthetics. While basking in public attention and mining it for income, they decried "market demand for all things 'Symbolist' " (Ellis), which transformed their Promethean project into a monetized commodity.[67] Minskii cautioned fellow "knights of the spirit" (*rytsari dukha*) about the appropriation of "new style by the bourgeois [*meshchane*] who turned it into a fashion, flooding the market with countless new-style trifles."[68] But there was little to be done about it, as long as the "knights of the spirit" remained susceptible to the market's financial lure. Under the circumstances, hierarchical differentiation was the lesser evil. One could publish in the general press and with commercial imprints, while saving texts that "mattered" for more prestigious, modernist venues, just as a writer's public persona could appeal, sending different messages, to a modernist coterie and the mass consumer at the same time. In this way, modernists could perpetuate their self-image of an elite keeping "sacred fires burning on esoteric heights invisible to the mob," which comprised "the general public and numerous impostors of Symbolism who perverted its terminology, trampled its ideas, and exchanged its eternal values for copper coins."[69]

In the factious modernist culture, the latter category potentially applied to any author enjoying a measure of public visibility.

The association of market success with hack writing and maladroit emulation said more about those invoking it than about those it purportedly described. Some authors whose art was acclaimed in the modernist community but who also sold well in the larger market could not be dismissed as easily as such "impostors and speculators" as Artsybashev and Verbitskaia. *The Petty Demon* rivaled the sales of *Sanin* and *Keys to Happiness*, making Sologub a fashionable author. To tackle the dilemma, the modernist community generated moralistic lore about Sologub's corruption by the market, manifest in his parvenu lifestyle and descent into lucrative graphomania.[70] Sologub reacted to such rumors by making the hero of his next novel, *The Created Legend*, an independently wealthy modernist writer and an unrecognized genius indifferent to public success.[71]

Incidentally, Chukovskii disseminated derisive rumors about Sologub, as if to exorcise his own unease about turning into "a feuilletonist rather than a good writer" and trading creativity (*tvorchestvo*) for professionalism (*masterstvo*) out of economic necessity.[72] The same projection mechanism was at work in Bal'mont's depiction of Belyi as a "literary prostitute" who "wrote for money" in violation of Pushkin's formula, "I write for myself but publish for money."[73] Ironically, Bal'mont's popularity, and his resultant literary income, outstripped anything Belyi could hope to achieve. Remizov, to cite another example, was among the most published and translated Russian modernists, at home and in exile. Yet, Remizov always insisted on his lack of recognition and literary income, favorably contrasting his starving artist persona to that of "'professional' writers, no different from other kinds of artisans."[74]

Modernist anti-mercantile rhetoric thus functioned as a marketing tool inside and outside the cultural community. The Cubo-Futurist faction painted its rivals as speculators and profiteers, in contrast to its own disinterested work.[75] In private, the Futurists did acknowledge that their rapid rise to fame, buttressed by skillful manipulation of the market, brought many economic benefits. Cross-country tours, mixing poetic recitals with public scandals, garnered Maiakovskii and company more substantial monetary rewards than their patron- or self-funded publications, despite the Futurists' latter-day claims to having been destitute artists striving for spiritual transcendence in isolation from the "bourgeois" public.[76]

One sign of their recognition was the Cubo-Futurists' admission to the

Petersburg nightclub the Stray Dog, where modernists performed for each other and in front of paying patrons. The latter, dubbed "pharmacists" by their beneficiaries, funded the cabaret through an admission fee—twenty-five rubles per ticket—equivalent to the cost of a private box at the Bolshoi Theatre.[77] The pharmacist tag was an anti-Semitic slur inspired by the visibility of Jews in the pharmaceutical trade, which, in the context of the empire's Judeophobe legislature, was a way out of the Pale of Settlement.[78] The appellation fused two modernist mythologemes—the bourgeois and the Jews—in yet another mechanism for negotiating artistic involvement with the free market. As discussed in the introduction, the traditional role of the Jews as the Other of the Christian imagination made them a vessel for psychological projection in European societies, where they symbolized negative aspects of modernity. Imbibing the Wagnerian equation of Jewishness to the commodification of culture, Russian modernists often decried the post-1905 expansion of their community as the "Judaization" of artistic life by spiritually alien speculators, code-named "pharmacists."[79]

Discussing the mainstream journals and newspapers for which they wrote in search of income, Belyi and Blok called them "the Yid press" (*zhidovskaia pressa*). Reflecting on financial disputes with editors, mostly non-Jewish, they conceptualized such professional conflicts as personal attempts not to "sell out to the Yids."[80] In public, loath to incur the opprobrium of the intelligentsia, which flaunted Judeophilia in its struggle with the tsarist state, Blok moderated his Wagnerian rhetoric.[81] "Pharmacist" was among the euphemisms he used to speak about the cultural producers who thrived in the mass market, and also about their "bourgeois" public, implicitly contrasting both to his own idea of the poet as a "spiritual apostle" and an "aristocrat of sensibility and thought."[82] The imaginary Jews assumed the blame for the frustrations and anxieties begotten by modernist interaction with the market, all the more so because cultural democratization stimulated the expansion of the corpus of Russian-Jewish artists, critics, journalists, editors, publishers, and patrons.[83] In the 1930s, Bal'mont still used the pharmacist trope in order to castigate his modernist foe and fellow exile, Vladislav Khodasevich, whom he dismissed as a "pharmaceutical versifier" (*farmatsevticheskii stikhotvorets*).[84]

Like other groups hitherto barred from the national field of cultural production, Jews flocked to the modernist sensibility as an emancipating alternative.[85] Liubov' Gurevich, carrying the dual stigma of femininity and Jewishness, coedited Russian modernism's first periodical, *Severnyi vestnik*, with

another Jewish littérateur, Akim Volynskii, stoking Chekhov's anti-Semitic ire.[86] Jewish authors Nikolai Minskii and Zinaida Vengerova were among the review's contributors. By the time Russian modernism reached the peak of its public visibility, in the 1910s, the culture accommodated several cohorts of writers of Jewish extraction. Jewish origins marginalized artists in a modernist culture that negotiated the incompatibility of charismatic authorship with the economics of cultural modernity through the symbolic language of Jewish difference. I will not dwell on this issue in detail, having treated it elsewhere.[87] Suffice it to say that, in contrast to writers, bound by their linguistic medium, Russian-Jewish visual artists found a more congenial, because cosmopolitan, modernist community in France.

In the complex interplay of the charismatic authorial model with the economics of cultural modernity, it is hard to outline a clear relationship between the artistic production of Russian modernists and the demands of the free market. Some causal links, however, are undeniable. Even hermetic artifacts could have been originally intended not only for coterie consumption but for a broader audience as well. Consider Belyi's *Petersburg*, whose high accessibility bar obfuscates the financial, and thus public-oriented, rationale behind the novel's creation. In 1911, Belyi used Briusov's mediation to secure a commission from Struve's *Russkaia mysl'*. Like Dostoevsky the professional littérateur, Belyi undertook, in dire economic straits, to write a novel quickly, complaining that money ruined his art and clamoring for an advance (1,000 rubles for thirteen printer's sheets, or three chapters, written in two months).[88] The fact that Struve found *Petersburg* unsuitable for his journal's intelligentsia readers—or that this "novel for writers" (Zamiatin) revolutionized Russian modernist prose—hardly obviates Belyi's initial idea of *Petersburg* as a cash cow. Ultimately, *Petersburg* took two years to write and garnered about 5,000 rubles. Belyi's modernist publisher, Sirin, sold only a third of the eponymous almanac (three thousand copies out of nine thousand) that serialized the novel (1913–14), recycling the remaining stock to reissue *Petersburg* in book form (1916).[89]

Why did Belyi think that a traditional thick journal could accommodate experimental prose? The heightened market demand for "new art," in tandem with Struve's role in the *Vekhi* critique of the intelligentsia (see chapter 4), opened the editor to a rapprochement with modernists: witness Briusov's appointment as the literary director of *Russkaia mysl'*.[90] The same market forces explain Belyi's reasoning. Reitblat points out that the post-1905 spike in public interest for "new art" reoriented modernists from poetry to prose

as a source of literary income.[91] Until *Petersburg*, modernist poetry had a higher accessibility bar than prose, which was, by the same token, a more desirable item for publishers. There was another pragmatic reason as well. Prose took more room than verse, while honoraria were calculated by units of space (a printer's sheet, a line, a word). The confluence of cheaper printing technology with the multiplication of paying readers, generally more interested in prose, gave publishers a better return on investment in prose. This explains the post-1905 reversal in the editorial policy of *Vesy*—hitherto a theoretical modernist forum eschewing prose fiction. Literary prose appeared in *Vesy* in response to rising demand for "new art," which promised the patron-subsidized review additional sources of income. Hence also Belyi's plan to write a long novel for serialization in a non-modernist periodical.

Publishing a book of modernist verse, one could hope, at best, to recoup printing costs. With some exceptions—the print runs of fashionable poets Bal'mont, Blok, and Severianin ranged between three and six thousand copies—modernist books of verse rarely appeared in more than five hundred copies and never sold out completely.[92] As a result, poets hoping to make some money demanded a modest honorarium (100–200 rubles) when signing a book contract, subsequent sales notwithstanding.[93] But the production of modernist books of verse was relatively affordable, 200 rubles at the most. Hence the common practice of self-publishing and the recourse to friends and acquaintances as Maecenases.[94] Poetry was meant for coterie consumption inside the modernist community, where its circulation could be even further restricted: Vladimir Gippius did not offer his *Pesni* (1897) for sale and prohibited press reviews; Aleksandr Dobroliubov's *Sobranie stikhov* (1900) was available by subscription only.[95] Verse publishing was an uncommercial gesture bestowing the aura of purity upon a book whose merit rested, in part, on its perceived difficulty or unpopularity. Rejection became a virtue and, by extension, a marketing tool making modernist poetry, unsullied by mercantilism, more desirable in the narrow circle of "true connoisseurs," including patrons, whose aid did not have to look like direct payment for art. This uncommercial system of dissemination persisted despite the rising public fortunes of Russian modernism after 1905, with poetry retaining its status as goods of symbolic rather than economic value.

Belyi was introduced to the economics of modernist publishing in 1902, when his first book, an experimental narrative the author defined as a "symphony," came out with Briusov's imprint Skorpion. The publication was funded by Belyi's mentor Mikhail Solov'ev—brother of philosopher Vladimir

Solov'ev and father of Belyi's friend and fellow poet Sergei Solov'ev.[96] What Belyi did in 1911, then, defied the logic of the market. He tried to sell experimental prose in a traditionalist venue, pitching his stylistic and narrative deconstruction of the novelistic genre to a thick journal—the print medium of the intelligentsia whose canon relied on the classical novel. We may never know if this was an attempt to bend the laws of the market while provocatively broadening the horizons of the intelligentsia reader or a miscalculation, with Belyi overestimating modernism's newfound symbolic capital. The market corrected the mismatch. *Petersburg* ultimately came out with a small modernist press (Sirin) that accepted the novel after Blok had lobbied its patron, industrialist Tereshchenko, on Belyi's behalf.[97]

Ironically, Struve's rapprochement with modernists aimed to breathe new life into the declining intelligentsia culture and its print medium of choice. The market played a role in this decline.[98] Soon after the authorities had shuttered the intelligentsia's flagship review, *Otechestvennye zapiski* (1884), it became clear just how outdated were the format and funding formula of analytical thick journals—*Mir bozhii*, *Russkaia mysl'*, *Russkoe bogatstvo*, *Russkii vestnik*, *Vestnik Evropy*—their ideological differences aside. They struggled to compete, in content and presentation, with newspapers and illustrated weeklies, which were favored by the mass consumer and, contrary to the puritanical intelligentsia format, embraced advertising to offset production costs. The print runs of the most-read thick journals, *Russkaia mysl'* and *Vestnik Evropy*, peaked at fourteen thousand copies, compared to the hundreds of thousands sold by illustrated weeklies (*Niva*, *Rodina*, *Ogonek*).[99] Besides, the professionalization of the educated elites eroded the demographic base of the thick journal, whose economic model—funding by subscription—grew precarious. The traditional intelligentsia, amateur dabblers in a variety of subjects, were being replaced by readers with specialized interests: between 1881 and 1900, the number of general-interest Russian periodicals grew by 53 percent; the number of those targeting professionals rose by 161 percent.[100]

After gaining access to the publishing mainstream, modernists more readily wrote for newspapers, illustrated weeklies, and literary almanacs than for thick journals, whose limited means could not match the honoraria paid in the commercially oriented press.[101] This avoidance of the thick journal was also payback for the intelligentsia's utilitarian view of art. Even in the 1910s, *Russkaia mysl'* paid more for essays (100 rubles per printer's sheet) than for literary prose (75 rubles per printer's sheet) and for poetry (the maximum

rate was 1 ruble per poem or 20 rubles per page for a long narrative poem or a poetic cycle).[102] The cultural market now sported specialized venues offering new ways to circumvent the intelligentsia's tastes. The literary almanac was one such resurgent format, whose economic viability was proven by Gorky's *Znanie* (1,088,000 copies sold in 1903–6). Almanacs mushroomed in the 1900s, in and outside modernist culture, becoming a major medium for disseminating fiction.[103] Thus, Struve's failure to reconcile the thick journal with modernist art, manifest in the *Petersburg* debacle, only confirmed the irreversible specialization of Russia's print media.

The modernist review was another specialized venue.[104] Sporting an even narrower readership than the general-interest thick journal and rarely condescending to advertising revenue, it survived by emulating the coterie-focused "little magazines" and literary journals of Western modernists—*Athenaeum*, *Pan*, *La Revue Blanche*, the *Savoy*, *Ver Sacrum*—which drew partial sustenance from a small subscription base and relied heavily on private donors.[105] Honoraria paid by modernist journals were patronage in disguise, since such periodicals never turned a profit and survived thanks to cash injections from sponsors.[106] Characteristically, when Gurevich tried to build the first periodical of nascent Russian modernism on the thick journal model, the project proved untenable.[107]

In 1891, Gurevich took over the struggling *Severnyi vestnik*, hitherto a traditional thick journal, intent on remaking it into a mouthpiece of "the pan-European 'modern' movement." The takeover cost 20,000 rubles—a gift from her father and uncle. But it soon transpired that propaganda of "new" ideas among the intelligentsia was a financial flop. "At times I regretted," recalled Gurevich, "not heeding the example of foreign 'youngsters,' who launched little magazines addressed solely to 'their own kind.'" She retained the thematic range, contributor pool, and target audience of the thick journal format, while repudiating much in the intelligentsia's philosophy and aesthetics.[108] Thus, even at its peak of 4,257 subscribers (cf. the weekly *Niva*'s 115,000, in 1891, and 235,000 in the early 1900s), *Severnyi vestnik* remained unprofitable. At this time, the "new sensibility" was still anathema in the intelligentsia culture, whereas the burgeoning modernist community was too small to compensate for the loss of subscribers.[109]

To make matters worse, Gurevich and Volynskii did not go far enough in the promotion of "new" aesthetics, antagonizing modernist contributors.[110] In 1898, the launch of the more radical and privately funded *Mir iskusstva*

coincided with the bankruptcy of *Severnyi vestnik*, whose debt approached 150,000 rubles. Gurevich blamed the journal's woes on censorship. But this, too, was a by-product of her chosen format, for censors objected only to sociopolitical content—the standard fare of thick journals that was subsequently excised from modernist periodicals as irrelevant to "the revolution of the spirit."[111] In a final gesture of anti-market defiance, addressed to modernist peers flaunting their altruistic motives for publishing in *Severnyi vestnik* in exchange for meager honoraria, Gurevich refused to sell the review (and pay her debts), since such commercialism would have defiled the ideals advocated on its pages.[112]

Gurevich's successors learned from her mistakes. Beginning with *Mir iskusstva*, they heeded the example of Western little magazines.[113] Their journals grew thinner, dropping content unrelated to the artistic and philosophical concerns of the modernist community; added visual material; and strove to make the reading of each issue a total aesthetic experience by means of original design and higher paper and print quality. All this made modernist little magazines costlier than thick journals and illustrated weeklies.[114] The generosity of patrons, however, had its limits, as reflected in the relative luxury or austerity of modernist reviews, in their inferior honoraria, and in the relatively poor remuneration of editorial labor.[115] Collaboration in modernist periodicals brought prestige and symbolic capital, but authors looked elsewhere for material sustenance.

The lifespan of modernist journals depended on the changing circumstances of donors and the entrepreneurial spirit of editors. *Mir iskusstva* owed its existence to Sergei Diaghilev's ability to secure the support of patrons. Savva Mamontov and Princess Tenisheva financed it initially, but the former went bankrupt, while the latter withdrew under pressure from the intelligentsia establishment. Emperor Nicholas II—improbably lobbied by painter Il'ia Repin, who was on friendly terms with Diaghilev but hated "new art"—paid the journal an annual subsidy of 10,000 rubles until the outbreak of the Russo-Japanese War. By then, Diaghilev's attention had shifted to other initiatives, and *Mir iskusstva* shut down for lack of funds in 1905.[116] *Zolotoe runo*, to take another example, was lavishly funded in its first two years (1906–7), by Nikolai Riabushinskii, a scion of an industrialist family. He ensured the journal's high quality and unusually large (for a modernist magazine) size—an average of 150 pages, compared to the 30–90 page range in *Mir iskusstva*.[117] But Riabushinskii's financial troubles, his growing impatience

with the journal's chronic budgetary shortfalls, and the refusal of numerous modernists to write for the journal, because the haughty patron did not show them due respect, put an end to *Zolotoe runo* in 1909.[118]

Modernist reviews imposed an expressive economy unknown to authors writing in thick journals.[119] Consider the scandal around the publication of Merezhkovskii's "L. Tolstoy and Dostoevsky" in *Mir iskusstva* (1901–2). While the editors found his essay too long, the author objected to Aubrey Beardsley's erotic drawings framing his solemn text, which the editors were loath to throw out of an issue overburdened by Merezhkovskii's longwinded prose.[120] The rise of the modernist press was particularly consequential to novelistic praxis. In contrast to the thick journal custom of serialization, modernist almanacs and magazines struggled to accommodate longer fiction. The serialization of *The Petty Demon* in *Voprosy zhizni* (1905) was aborted by the journal's financial woes, after the novel had been rejected by *Novyi put'*, which could not meet the author's honorarium demands.[121] Kuzmin's *Wings* took up an entire issue of *Vesy* (11 [1906]), squeezing out other content. The serialization of Briusov's *Fiery Angel* (1907) and Belyi's *Silver Dove* in *Vesy* (1909) amounted to self-publishing, since both authors steered the review's editorial policy. Briusov admonished fellow modernists, who fretted about long waiting times for prose submissions in *Vesy*, that the journal had to remain "thin" (6–7 printer's sheets a month, in his estimate) or perish.[122] And none of the aforementioned texts approached in size Tolstoy's and Dostoevsky's novels, no matter how hard intelligentsia critics wanted to see in the post-1905 proliferation of longer modernist prose a revival of the classical novel.[123]

Prose was a breadwinner in the cultural market, and so it made little sense to place longer works in modernist periodicals with limited circulation, constrained space, and small honorarium budgets. *The Petty Demon* became a success only after its reissue in book form.[124] Other early modernist novels that gained notoriety—*Sanin*, *Wings*, *Thirty-Three Freaks*, *The Keys to Happiness*—skipped serialization altogether.[125] The popularity of the almanac format further steered writers toward shorter prose as a gift that kept on giving, since it could also be accommodated in newspapers and weeklies and then reissued in book form. Modernists thus had compelling economic reasons to favor short fiction over the novel—a genre central to the intelligentsia canon and, consequently, in need of deconstruction.[126] Its narrative and stylistic revamping in *Petersburg*, theorized in Belyi's essays, stood out against indifference toward the novelistic genre in current modernist cul-

ture.[127] But even *Petersburg* owed its birth, above all, to a fortuitous confluence of market conditions with the author's financial needs.[128]

A similar dynamic was manifest abroad. By the 1890s, consumerist mass culture displaced the Victorian three-decker from its preeminent position, making veteran novelist Henry James "struggle to get down his wordage into the cramped confines of a magazine installment."[129] In Western Europe, too, the short story became definitional to modernism as a basic unit of magazine publication.[130] In Russia, market-induced shifts in the hierarchy of genres proved irreversible for the same reasons British novelists, "once accustomed to writing short pieces for easy money, would find it hard to turn their backs on Fleet Street while slowly incubating a major work."[131] Symptomatically, in the 1900s, critical statements about "adverse conditions for the flowering of the multi-volume novel" became commonplace in Russia.[132]

The novel's fall from grace was so dramatic that a modernist critic cautioned readers against seeing the essence of Russian "new art" in "the replacement of multivolume novels with novellas or poems in prose."[133] *Petersburg*'s serialization coincided with Eikhenbaum's 1913 verdict about the peripheral place of the novelistic genre in literary life.[134] Like their Western counterparts—T. S. Eliot in "*Ulysses*, Order and Myth" (1923), José Ortega y Gasset in "The Decline of the Novel" (1925), Walter Benjamin in "The Crisis of the Novel" (1930)—Russians explained the classical novel's decline by its incompatibility with new ideas of time, space, and personality.[135] No modernist author linked artistic praxis to the market-imposed evolution of print media, thereby making other explanations of the novel's crisis look like rationalizations eliding the taboo topic of the economics of cultural modernity.

The topic was particularly uncomfortable in Russia, where the novel had been identified with literary creativity as a whole. The genre's slide in the hierarchy of "serious" forms—manifest in the mass consumer's appetite for the newspaper-serialized novels of adventure, biography, crime, romance, and science fiction—was experienced as a sign of a larger cultural decline threatening the charismatic authorial ideal, whose discursive (prophetic and didactic) prerogatives had found such a natural fit in the sprawling nineteenth-century novel. The sense of crisis linking the distressed charismatic institution of authorship to the ailing novelistic genre was enhanced by high modernism's metaliterary focus on the novel's deconstruction. This focus—manifest in the steady post-*Petersburg* stream of novelistic metafictions, jus-

tified by Formalist theory—elevated the artist and the creative process to the status of art's main subject matter.

Michael Levenson has suggested that the coincidence of the widely debated crisis of the novel with the rise of self-conscious modernist cultures across Europe contributed to the privileged status of critical theory in transnational modernism, which made literary creation and theoretical reflection inseparable and interchangeable.[136] Furnishing a rationale for modernist metanovels—which Eikhenbaum dubbed *romany s "pisatelem"* (novels with/about "a writer")—Formalists zeroed in on the implications of the classical novel's decline for the evolving institution of authorship.[137] This market-induced evolution became a major point of Formalist (self-)reflection, providing today's cultural cartographers of Russian modernism with a convenient passage from the story of the community's interaction with the capitalist market to the story of its adjustment to new economic realities after the Bolshevik coup.

The Formalist Writer-Type and the Evolving Institution of Authorship

The romantic authorial model fostered the kind of criticism that played down the importance of the audience as a determinant of artistic value. This critical philosophy, M. H. Abrams has argued, was enshrined in the figure of the "Poet as Hero, the chosen one who, because he is 'a Force of Nature,' writes as he must, and through the degree of homage he evokes, serves as the measure of his *reader*'s piety and taste."[138] Absorbing the romantic model, transnational modernism went further in its critical praxis: it studied aesthetic concepts within the imaginative work they described, endowing criticism with the trappings of artistic creativity. In Russian modernism—whose theoretical self-awareness often overshadowed artistic practice, as testified by the predominance of essays over fiction in the community's periodicals—critical discourse was a form of imaginative expression on a par with other modes of aesthetic activity.

Thus, waxing nostalgic about his youth, Chukovskii recalled the 1900s and early 1910s as his most creative period, when he "fought for new forms in critical essay writing."[139] Concurrently, "poet-philologists" Bal'mont and Briusov merged theory and practice in metadescriptive verses teaching the public, befuddled by utilitarian criticism, how to read poetry.[140] Belyi, Viacheslav Ivanov, and Briusov wrote academic-style treatises on prosody that became primers for the subsequent cohorts of versifiers. The latter often

formed workshops devoted to the study of poetry and literary history as the backdrop for the peer critique of their verses. This overriding focus on applied theory ramped up pressure on the charismatic authorial ideal, already strained by the economics of cultural modernity. "Symbolist-craftsmen and Symbolist-aesthetes are now equally inconceivable," Ivanov noted in 1912.[141] By then, modernist poets had to seek a balance between the romantic cult of inspired genius and a literary professional's studied craftsmanship—a posture they dubbed "sacred craft" (*sviatoe remeslo*).[142]

Russian modernism's theoretical penchant intensified during its first crisis, when infighting made "an independent and exact science of aesthetics our most urgent priority," Belyi observed in 1907.[143] This science dissented from traditional criticism, ideological and impressionistic, and from university literary studies, deemed obsolete.[144] The striving to remake criticism by fusing the "new sensibility" with rigorous scholarship was a corollary of the modernist quest for artistic autonomy. The Formalist milieu partook in this project. Grudgingly acknowledging their modernist precursors, Formalists vied for the exclusive status of professional scholar-critics.[145] Asserting themselves through vanguardist posturing and generational antagonism, they attacked Briusov's and Belyi's studies in prosody, and early modernist theory more generally, as lacking in scientific rigor.[146] But there was something metaphysical about their own vision of literature as a unique discursive mode, a vision resonating with the larger modernist aspiration to the autonomy of art's creators and interpreters—two categories Formalists strove to merge.

What makes the Formalists a fruitful case study in the evolution of the Russian institution of authorship is their innovative grafting of the ethos of professionalism on the modernist sensibility, compounded by personal involvement in the literary process as advocates of modernist practices and as artists in their own right.[147] Formalists styled themselves as a new writer-type that viewed criticism, scholarship, and imaginative literature as homologous modes of expression and structured quotidian behavior as an aesthetic text, in keeping with the common modernist merger of life and art.[148] Hence their prerogative to be not just critics and scholars but artists. This was, Eikhenbaum insisted, "a question of life building [*zhiznestroenie*] and life conduct [*zhiznepovedenie*]" as well as a "way out of the pitiful 'professorial' existence" to which these detractors of university science struggled to adjust when post-1917 economic hardships forced them to seek academic employment.[149]

An exponent of the new writer-type, Viktor Shklovskii "bore no resemblance to the traditional intelligentsia writer thanks to his thorough professionalism," opined Eikhenbaum. "One is hard pressed to pigeonhole Shklovskii as a littérateur, scholar, journalist, and what not; for he is a writer in the full sense of the word."[150] The same was true for Eikhenbaum, whose ambition surpassed criticism and scholarship: witness the generic and stylistic hybrids of *My Diary* (*Moi Vremennik*, 1929) and *Lev Tolstoi* (1928–31).[151] Iurii Tynianov furnished another example of the Formalist writer-type. His historical novels (*Kiukhlia*, 1925; *The Death of the Vazir-Mukhtar*, 1927–28)—like Shklovskii's autobiographical narratives (*Zoo*, 1923; *A Sentimental Journey*, 1923; *The Third Factory*, 1926)—mixed fact with fiction, imaginative writing with criticism and scholarship, and reached out to the general public while self-consciously illustrating Formalist theories, visible to the initiated.[152]

For Eikhenbaum, professionalism encapsulated the key feature of the new writer-type—the fusion of elitism with unapologetic market-savvy practicality. Lidiia Ginzburg absorbed this formula from her teachers as "expedient for the purposes of welfare."[153] The Formalist authorial model justified writing as a commercial activity while upholding the perennial modernist sense of cultural superiority. Ostensibly contradictory, such a pairing was not without precedents. Suffice it to recall the clashing prerogatives of artistic autonomy and economic viability in the British Arts and Crafts movement.[154] The Formalists were no less bent on asserting art's autonomy than their modernist precursors. To this end, they cast literature as a difficult discursive form—because written in a particular, "literary" language—requiring specially trained exegetes.[155] *Professionalism* was the term they used to denote both their "scientific" approach to literature and their ostentatious marketplace pragmatism.[156] In contrast to fellow modernists who dealt with the market's economic pressure by imagining a hierarchy of print venues and of texts suitable for each venue, the Formalists aspired to erase barriers between elitist and popular writing modes, just as they tried to level distinctions among fiction, criticism, scholarship, diary, journalism, and biography.[157]

The reasons for this break with extant modernist practices are not hard to grasp. The Formalist promotion of professionalism responded to Russia's socioeconomic upheaval.[158] By mid-1918, the Bolsheviks had shuttered all independent press and publishers.[159] The nationalization of private property, the war economy, and Marxist social engineering altered the cultural market, forcing artists to choose between exile and a precarious life in Soviet Russia. By Robert Maguire's estimate, in 1918–21 the average writer earned

180,000–240,000 rubles a month, compared to 350,000 paid to unskilled workers. Also, as members of the "liberal professions," writers faced higher taxes and rents.[160] With the arrival of limited private enterprise, under the New Economic Policy (NEP), the State Publishing House estimated that one could make ends meet by turning out sixty printed pages a month. At this breakneck pace, writers aspiring to live by the pen had to opt for hackwork as a full-time "second occupation."[161] Competition exacerbated the situation. Since the prestige of literary authorship remained high, educated individuals barred from other careers by Bolshevik policies flocked to literature. While the number of publishing outlets grew after 1921, so did income inequality among writers. The NEP-era prerogative of economic profitability made both public and private publishers court the mass reader, ignoring state-mandated tariffs for "literary labor." Writers in demand earned more than their less fortunate colleagues, who eked out a living through hackwork, keeping a lid on their ideological quarrels with the Marxist state.[162]

The semiprivate NEP market proved more ruthless than its capitalist counterparts in tsarist Russia and abroad. The stakes were now higher, because failure to earn a living by writing could not be offset by such bygone fallback options as family fortunes or private patronage. In these circumstances, expatriation became a viable alternative even for writers who had no ideological ax to grind with the Bolsheviks. For artists remaining in Soviet Russia, the Formalist authorial model made a virtue of necessity. It codified writing for a dual audience, the modernist coterie and the mass consumer, legitimating hackwork (*khaltura*)—pulp fiction, screenplays, translation, editorial work, journalism, book reviews, and children's literature. Taking stock of the modernist community in *A Goat Song* (1927), Konstantin Vaginov parodied the Formalist discourse of professionalism: in this novelistic metafiction, a poet cynically flaunts his writings for children and opportunistic criticism—for which "idiots pay money"—and scolds the market phobia of a squeamish colleague as an attitude out of sync with modernity.[163] But, to fit into the Formalist authorial model, hack writing, for adults or for children, had to be offset by self-reflexivity signaling one's ironic distance from cultural mercantilism.

"A decent critic who is not a softie must be able to write, at a drop of a hat, a competent novel, even if a bad one," preached Shklovskii, implicitly dismissing the romantic values of talent, inspiration, and originality in favor of professionalism.[164] His own "bad novel," the cloak-and-dagger potboiler *Mustard Gas* (*Iprit*, 1925; coauthored with Vsevolod Ivanov), was part of a

larger 1920s phenomenon, Red Pinkerton fiction, that took the form of serialized suspense and adventure novels by modernists in search of an income (Il'ia Erenburg, Marietta Shaginian, etc.). Addressing a dual audience—the Soviet mass consumer and a coterie privy to the metaliterariness of ostensibly lowbrow narratives—purveyors of Red Pinkerton fiction negotiated the tension between elitism and professionalism inherent in the Formalist writer-type, effectively realizing Shklovskii's parable about circus wrestlers who held secret reunions to fight for real in order not to drown in hackwork (*ne iskhalturit'sia*).[165] The same authorial model informed, to varying degrees, the NEP-era careers of Maiakovskii, the OBERIU poets, and Chukovskii, all of them forced by economic necessity to write for children and to dabble in hackwork for adults—from serialized pulp fiction (Chukovskii) to versified ads (Maiakovskii).[166]

Justifying their ethos of professionalism by the market's evolution, Formalists cast this evolution as an existential threat to literature. In Eikhenbaum's view, new media, especially cinema, and changing demographics—with the mass consumer overshadowing the intelligentsia—required that critics become "true littérateurs, authoritative professionals" able to safeguard literature in dire circumstances.[167] In the same year, 1924, Tynianov argued that critics had already replaced writers of fiction in the public eye. "The old reader of journals and almanacs first devoured poetry and only then turned to prose. More recently minted readers avoided verses, devouring prose [. . .] Lately, the reader has been avoiding poetry and prose alike" for the sake of literary criticism and theory, concluded Tynianov with visible satisfaction, for this boded well for the Formalists' position in the cultural market.[168] In the 1920s, Formalism indeed became fashionable, like previous modernist "isms." And like their modernist precursors, Formalists both basked in the public vindication of their ideas and deplored their epigonic profanation.[169]

In and of itself, the need to survive in the Soviet cultural market cannot explain the self-reflexive and historicizing turn of Formalist theorists to the problematics of authorship, which they dubbed *literaturnyi byt* (the literary everyday). It looks as though this newfound interest also functioned as a legitimating mechanism shielding the Formalist writer-type from the hostility it encountered in the modernist community and among Marxists. Theorizing the pragmatic side of creativity, Formalists killed two birds with one stone. They elaborated a non-Marxist literary sociology and wrote themselves into it.[170] For Shklovskii, professionalism was tantamount to the em-

brace of one's historical moment—a prerogative of any writer who wished to stay "modern."[171] Hence his theory of hackwork as an honest form of economic survival, provided one did not try to pass off opportunistic writing as genuine art.[172] The Marxist state's hostility to the partial freedom of the NEP market also figured in Formalist thought. But since a frank discussion of Soviet ideological pressure on art was impossible, economic pressure became a euphemism for other limitations imposed by modernity on cultural producers. Russia's historical past, with its capitalist cultural market, could thus function as a parable of the present, especially with reference to the clash between the Formalist writer-type and the charismatic authorial ideal inherited by modernists and Marxists from the intelligentsia.[173]

Consider Shklovskii's implicit linking of his condition as a writer to that of Dostoevsky, whose novels "had been created not by freedom" but by socioeconomic contingencies. Shklovskii contrasted this modern condition to Tolstoy's antiquated retreat from literary professionalism.[174] Going even further back in time, Eikhenbaum started his sociology with "the professionalization of literary labor" in Pushkin's day. Exploring the ramifications of cultural modernity in the nineteenth century—the democratization of artistic production and consumption, new forms of socialization and dissemination (thick journals), the shifting hierarchies of genres and discursive modes—Eikhenbaum emphasized the struggle for autonomy from censorious patrons as literary professionalism's positive corollary, even at the cost of reliance on the "bourgeois" market. In his reading, professionalism was about the quest for artistic autonomy and, by extension, about the choice between two evils—patronage and the capitalist market. Like Shklovskii, Eikhenbaum turned historical material into a transparent parable for his own condition as a littérateur negotiating the clashing demands of the censorious Marxist patron-state and the competitive NEP market. And like Shklovskii, he preferred the market, justifying his choice by historical inevitability, illustrated with the same example of Tolstoy's flight into "literary dilettantism" as an outlived aristocratic attitude.[175]

Such a validation of professionalism was expedient enough to challenge Russian modernism's fixation on charismatic authorship. It both justified cultural mercantilism and countered Marxist attacks on modernism's "undemocratic elitism." In fact, when articulated by Marxist radicals—the RAPP, for one, targeted modernists as part of its own rebellion against the romantic notion of individual genius—such attacks irked mainstream Marxist critics, who adapted the intelligentsia's cult of authorial charisma as a mechanism

for consecrating writers into the nascent Soviet canon.[176] This political context was an unspoken factor in the Formalist treatment of charismatic authorship as a quaint carryover from the dying intelligentsia culture and the preserve of modernism's "would-be 'aristocrats' favoring private patronage over professional labor."[177] This caricaturing of Russian modernism's historical rapport with the market aimed to neutralize Marxist attacks on Formalists as exponents of modernist culture and to promote their writer-type as the pinnacle of modernity and a natural fit for the socialist society in the making.

Modernists cultivating authorial charisma deplored the Formalist glorification of professionalism. As Ginzburg noted, while "the [intellectual] evolution of Formalists was subjectively sincere and historically necessary," it was also "objectively profitable; yet, those around us, party-affiliated or not, were still too mired in the intelligentsia [ethics] to respect people for engaging in lucrative activities."[178] Witness Akhmatova's contempt for Shklovskii as a cultural philistine, Mandel'shtam's defense of poetry as "sacred craft"—a conception whose erosion he blamed on the discourse of literary professionalism which had unleashed an "army of poets"—and Adamovich's sarcastic quibble about Shklovskii: "Maybe he is a poet, maybe not, maybe a critic, maybe not, maybe a scholar, maybe not."[179] Tynianov, in contrast, hailed the "borderline" quality of Shklovskii's oeuvre and authorial persona as a welcome challenge to the "ceremonious differentiation between science and art in our cultural life."[180]

Exacerbating the clash of authorial models, the origins of many Formalists made them vulnerable to the Wagnerian invocation of Jewishness prominent in the negotiation of incompatibility between the romantic vision of the artist and the modern cultural market. Thus, subscribing to the Formalist equation of criticism and scholarship to artistic creativity, Vladislav Khodasevich resented much else in Formalism's "essentially Jewish method."[181] Ironically, a cultural retrograde and fellow émigré, Ivan Shmelëv, assimilated Khodasevich the modernist poet and critic, whose Jewish roots were public knowledge, to Formalists as "non-Aryans of modernity" (*neariitsy sovremennosti*), bringing their heterogeneous critical methods to the common denominator of art's spiritual "circumcision."[182]

It is hardly accidental that the Formalist milieu attracted individuals of Jewish origin. Like their precursor, Akim Volynskii, many Formalists initially spurned academic careers both because of their literary ambitions and because such careers were closed to Jews by legal restrictions and institutional

bias.[183] The identities of Russian-Jewish Formalists varied, but in the eyes of contemporaries they were, above all, Jews. Roman Jakobson was a scion of baptized Jewish parents and a practicing Christian.[184] Eikhenbaum had a Russian Orthodox mother and a baptized Jewish father, but his surname was enough to irritate university professors.[185] Shklovskii had a baptized Jewish father and a Protestant mother. But, contrary to Eikhenbaum's positive self-image, he absorbed the ambient anti-Semitism of the day, making the Wagnerian trope of Jewish cultural infertility part of his authorial persona.[186] Tynianov was the only Jewish member of the first Formalist cohort to avoid baptism, which could have improved his academic prospects. Incidentally, his cousin, Viktor Zhirmunskii, got baptized only after the demise of Judeophobe legislation in February 1917, in a proud affirmation of Russianness untainted by opportunism.[187]

To be sure, the lifting of tsarist restrictions still left Formalists vulnerable to the discourse of Jewish difference. Ginzburg's Jewish identity was largely reactive by virtue of responding to conspiracy theories, swirling in Soviet Russia, about the Jewish takeover of higher education and cultural life.[188] Ultimately, these theories informed the official inquest into "Jewish sabotage in literary studies," targeting ex-Formalists during the anti-Semitic campaign on the eve of Stalin's death.[189] But in the 1910s–20s, the Jewish stigma provided Formalists with an arrow in the quiver of their quintessential modernity, reinforcing the novelty of the writer-type they promoted. Jewish origins permitted a number of Formalists to cultivate vanguardist marginality both in the larger field of cultural production and inside the modernist community, where their embrace of professionalism lent itself to Wagnerian denunciations.

For all the pushback against the Formalist writer-type, its appeal in modernist culture surpassed the mere rationalization of economic necessity. Pasternak never adjusted to the NEP market, being, in Ginzburg's words, incapable of hackwork.[190] Yet the poet insisted that, in the 1920s, he had traded the "neoromantic" model of authorship for the idea of writing as "craftsmanship" (*remeslo*).[191] His fellow ex-Futurists, grouped in the LEF and more adept at mining the market for economic benefits, also replaced their earlier posture of prophets and priests with that of craftsmen filling social needs (*sotsial'nyi zakaz*).[192] Accordingly, their advocacy of cultural democratization entailed the abandonment of the romantic notion of genius for the sake of another vision of creative activity as an exercise of professional skills. Echoing Marxist hostility to charismatic modernist self-stylization—hostility

rooted in the idea of art as a by-product of politics, whereby authorial charisma was determined by a writer's imputed political agenda—the professional posture of ex-Futurists was a tactical move deflecting Marxist attacks on their origins in modernist culture.[193] But even as the LEF's theory took its ultimate shape in the "literature of the fact" doctrine, the group continued to affirm modernist superiority in the cultural market by implicitly granting the full mastery of professional literary skills only to its associates, Formalists included.[194]

While Formalists could not openly discuss the political underpinnings of their reflection on the evolving institution of authorship, exiled modernists denounced their writer-type as a gesture of political surrender. Adamovich saw it as the first step in the "slow disappearance of freedom which the ideologues of Soviet literature called *development*." This allusion to Formalism's evolutionary view of the literary process and attendant insistence on the modern writer's requisite adaptation to historical circumstances cast Formalists, and their LEF associates, as self-immolating traitors to genuine art. In Adamovich's view, those modernists who spurned authorship as a charismatic institution facilitated the Marxist takeover of cultural life through "the 'planned' narrowing of the rights and responsibilities of the creative personality, which ultimately destroyed the very notion of creativity."[195] Speaking from the other side of the geopolitical divide, Adamovich refrained from discussing the challenges faced by émigré authors, whose economic condition was not exacerbated by political pressure to the same extent as it would have been in the USSR. Nonetheless, we should not underestimate the role of politics in modernism's interaction with the cultural market in Russia Abroad, if only because the mutually defining polarization of Soviet and émigré subsystems in the Russian field of cultural production was political above all else. Politics, then, are an integral part of the economic story of the interwar Russian modernist community.

The Political Economy of Russian Modernism

Modernism's revolt against the intelligentsia entailed the creation of an autonomous system for cultural production and dissemination. Not without historical irony, the fin-de-siècle revival of patronage, whose earlier decline had stimulated the quest for artistic autonomy across Europe, supported modernist aspirations to freedom from external pressures. Private patronage helped Russian "new art" weather the hostility of the educated elites and the demands of the market. As a "patronage culture" (Delaney), trans-

national modernism built itself a rickety shelter, not least because the archaic nature of patronage flew in the face of cultural modernity.[196] As Robert Louis Stevenson put it, to abandon popular fiction and write "seriously," he needed money from patrons and "a change in my nature that I shall be content to take it from them instead of earning it."[197] Thus, if Joyce, Eliot, and Pound accepted cash gifts from donors whenever honoraria from patron-funded magazines and imprints ran low, their Russian peers preferred to supplement their livelihood with "honest 'literary' income" (Blok) in the mass-circulation press rather than "supplicate Maecenases" (Belyi).[198] Yet the readiness of Russian modernists to engage with patrons, who funded most of the community's group ventures before 1917, laid the groundwork for their economic survival strategies in the interwar years.

With its economic bases destroyed in Soviet Russia, private patronage did not reemerge in the NEP era. At the same time, modernists remained committed to the autonomy of the aesthetic artifact, drawing the ire of Marxist critics, who denounced the notion of artistic autonomy as the most noxious aspect of the modernist sensibility.[199] This continuity of modernist preoccupations was unsustainable without some form of patronage. The modernist community sought the Marxist state's protection from the market, while aspiring to intellectual and aesthetic independence—a utopian position that collapsed during the Cultural Revolution. Jockeying for the state's favors was par for the course even among the Formalist promoters of market pragmatism. Consider the issue of *LEF* (1 [1924]) that sported Formalist eulogies to Lenin disguised as studies of the deceased dictator's style.[200] In Russian modernist culture, such public displays of political loyalty were less acceptable than participation in informal patronage networks around party bosses. Witness the wry (self-)description of modernists publicly currying the regime's favor as prostitutes—a traditional metaphor for artistic commerce with the market—and as converts to Judaism—another stock trope of mercantilism, hailing from the Wagnerian discourse.[201]

State patronage was not a new phenomenon in transnational modernism. In fin-de-siècle Austria and France, "new art" was deemed conducive to greater national cohesion and sponsored by government agencies.[202] In Russian modernist experience, however, the closest brush with state patronage had hitherto been Nicolas II's subsidy to *Mir iskusstva*, paid from the emperor's own private purse. In Soviet Russia, state patronage came from two sources—public institutions and party officials. Sheila Fitzpatrick notes that "patronage relations were part of the well-placed Soviet citizen's sur-

vival kit. And no sector of the elite was more intensive in its pursuit of patrons, or more successful in finding them in the heights of the Party leadership, than the Soviet 'creative intelligentsia.' "[203] Patronage by party bosses was a nonmarket source of goods and services at a time of severe shortages and a shield from Marxist radicals and state bureaucracy. In 1922, Mandel'shtam went on record promoting the idea of state-funded art. Writers should retain, he argued, aesthetic and intellectual autonomy, repaying the state with spiritual and cultural legitimacy. And since, in his charismatic authorial ideal, writers were the priestly guardians of higher values, the poet cast the arrangement as a revival of the old practice whereby princes sponsored churches and monasteries.[204]

Barbara Walker's study of patronage relations in early Soviet literary life shows the systematic nature of clientelistic networking by writers, modernists in particular. She argues that Marxists molded their recalcitrant modernist and intelligentsia rivals through a mix of bureaucratic pressure and personal rapport. This mutually beneficial commerce produced a social contract that offered aid to artists in exchange for cultural legitimacy (just as Mandel'shtam posited), foreshadowing the Stalinist contract between the state and the "creative intelligentsia."[205] In exile, Khodasevich decried as cynical this pact between writers, who took "Soviet money" but despised its source, and Bolsheviks, who "unscrupulously 'utilized' such people [. . .] for a sociopolitical revolution that had nothing to do with the revolution of the spirit."[206] Other commentators greeted the arrangement as congenial to the market phobia of the educated elites. Lucrative collaboration with publicly funded periodicals, imprints, and agencies, as well as the salutary intervention of patrons wielding state power and resources, played into modernist striving for artistic autonomy, promising to eliminate the artist's economic dependence on the paying public.[207]

In 1926, Dmitrii Mirskii lambasted the political servility of Maiakovskii and his LEF associates as detrimental to their poetry. Yet he distinguished them favorably from Erenburg, who was politically servile and, "worse, a slave to the [mass] consumer."[208] By this logic, we could read Khodasevich's and Mirskii's condemnation of the social contract between artists and the Marxist state as contingent on the émigré modernists' circumstances. Exile placed them at a disadvantage vis-à-vis peers who enjoyed the fruits of collaboration with the state. Had they remained in Russia, where Mirskii would ultimately return, they might have followed Mandel'shtam's recipe, tested as early as 1918 by future émigré foes of Lenin's rule, Z. Gippius and Merezh-

kovskii.[209] The mix of market phobia and economic necessity opened modernists to the social contract with Marxists. Nikolai Berdiaev, another émigré modernist critic of Bolshevism, told Soviet interrogators on the eve of his deportation, in 1922, that he rejected democracy as the source of mass culture inimical to his ideal of a spiritual aristocracy, whose creative activity could complement state power, if only the two were in a collaborative relationship.[210]

Mandel'shtam's and Berdiaev's stances remained viable insofar as the state did not lay exclusive claims to cultural authority, as it finally did in 1928. The terms of the social contract were fluid in early Soviet patronage relations. Feeling indebted to individual patrons rather than to the state, artists could sweep under the rug negative implications of commerce with authorities.[211] Some Bolshevik officials, like Lunacharskii, subscribed to the utopia of state-funded artistic autonomy; others simply hoped to entice a segment of the recalcitrant educated elites, thereby breaking the regime's initial isolation.[212] The early Soviet patronage system may explain the limited appeal of the Formalist writer-type among the modernist carriers of the charismatic authorial ideal, who viewed state sponsorship as a viable alternative to professionalism or as its face-saving complement. Be that as it may, from 1918 onward, party officials—Bukharin, Ezhov, Kamenev, Lunacharskii, Voronskii, Zinov'ev—and influential public figures (e.g., Gorky) were surrounded by clientelistic networks of mostly modernist artists, like the aristocratic *salonniers* of yore.

Modernists who sought sponsorship directly from state institutions, with some joining the party, also did so in the name of artistic autonomy. Reliance on the state, they reasoned, was less onerous than dependence on the market. After February 1917, the modernist community rallied for the separation of art from the state, insisting that the nascent republic should subsidize artistic autonomy.[213] In the wake of Lenin's coup, most modernists persisted in this strategy. Lunacharskii's call on cultural producers to join with the Bolsheviks was initially answered by very few modernists (Natan Al'tman, Sergei Chekhonin, Aleksei Karev, Aleksandr Matveev, Nikolai Punin, David Shterenberg, Petr Vaulin), who formed the core of the agency, the Department of Visual Arts (IZO), in charge of artistic life. Maiakovskii's faction balked at the open-door policy of the Commissar for People's Enlightenment.[214] But political repression in the summer of 1918, ending independent publishing against the backdrop of a collapsing economy, showed the material benefits of working with the state: Osip Brik and Maiakovskii joined

the IZO in the footsteps of Vasilii Kandinskii, Kazimir Malevich, and Vladimir Tatlin.[215] The move entailed a public embrace of Bolshevism and a rewriting of one's modernist past (having lost his large family fortune, Brik was particularly active in recasting Cubo-Futurism as a proletarian aesthetic).[216]

In the winter of 1918–19, ensconced in the state apparatus, the radicals of Russian modernism found themselves in control of the national field of cultural production. They used the state's resources for the lucrative promotion of their artistic agendas instead of political activism (which left them cold) and stifled rival artistic practices, modernist or otherwise.[217] This was the first in a series of such attempts in transnational modernism to advance the utopian dream of state-sponsored autonomy as a shield from the market. In 1923, Ezra Pound tried to persuade Benito Mussolini to launch a cultural patronage program, to be directed by Pound. In 1925, F. T. Marinetti explained to Maiakovskii that Fascism did for Italy what Communism did for Russia.[218] But the reign of Russia's modernist radicals was brief: it was rolled back in the spring of 1919. The aesthetically conservative Bolshevik leadership, eager to break its isolation from the educated public, could not afford to alienate the latter by keeping modernist sectarians in a position of cultural authority. Institutional support for ex-Futurists became sporadic, as testified by the precarious life of their state-funded press, from *Iskusstvo kommuny* (1918–19) to *LEF* (1923–25, 1927–28). The modernist community, meanwhile, denounced the opportunism of its radicals as an affront to the charismatic values of artistic autonomy and anti-mercantilism.[219] Other modernist factions wasted no time in profiting from their rivals' downfall: the moment the IZO radicals lost control of cultural affairs, the Free Philosophical Association (Vol'fila) secured a subsidy from Lunacharskii's Commissariat, while insisting on its autonomy from the state, which bankrolled it until 1924.[220]

The NEP dealt another blow to modernist radicals. Renewed market competition and loss of subsidies spelled the end of the era when they could propagate politically loyal art with a narrow aesthetic appeal.[221] In 1922, Erenburg and Lisitskii's Berlin journal *Veshch'* pronounced the death of "state art" in Russia. Predicating vanguardism on public funding, the editors decried "art's separation from the state" under the NEP as a triumph of "bourgeois" values.[222] The concurrent revival of state-funded thick journals reinforced the modernist perception of the NEP market as anachronistic.[223] Those actors in the modernist community who had not availed themselves of the state's largess to the same extent before 1921 gloated at the ex-Futurists'

travails.[224] But schadenfreude hardly alleviated their own troubles. Under the NEP, art's relative autonomy from the state came with economic insecurity. For most of the decade, modernists were hard pressed to find the right balance between engagement with the market and state patronage. The pragmatic NEP era presented a special conceptual problem to authors like Akhmatova and Mandel'shtam, who balked at the Formalist writer-type yet strained to reconcile their charismatic authorial ideal, and attendant personal mythologies, with the material benefits they effectively derived from the competitive NEP market and from the state patronage system.[225]

In 1922, fearing that the contract between artists and the state might collapse under the strain of revived market competition and shrinking public investment in the arts, the Party tried to offset the NEP's effects with disguised subsidies to writers in the form of state-funded mutual aid societies and a publishing house, Gosizdat, that was to print literary journals and books on the condition of their ideological neutrality.[226] All this fell short of securing cultural production with no mass appeal: Gosizdat reduced *LEF*'s print run from 5,000 in 1923 to 1,500 in 1925, shuttering the journal that year.[227] No professions of loyalty lavished by *LEF* on the party-state outweighed the market logic of supply and demand.[228] All the more so because Bolsheviks refused to endorse a given artistic faction or practice.[229] Gosizdat relaunched the journal in 1927 as *Novyi LEF*, no doubt under pressure from Maiakovskii's patrons.[230] And although the inaugural issue opened with an editorial decrying "market demand as a yardstick of cultural value," the journal's print run promptly dropped from 3,000 to 2,400.[231] *Novyi LEF* closed in 1928, its economic insolvency exacerbated by political contingency, to wit, the anti-modernist assault of the RAPP's Marxist radicals, emboldened by the Cultural Revolution and by the triumph of Stalin's faction, which caused the downfall of many patrons who had hitherto protected modernists.[232]

Modernists had few options for coping with the NEP market. One could teach in public academic establishments. The Institute for Artistic Culture (Moscow) sheltered Malevich, Punin, and Shterenberg; and the State Institute for the History of the Arts (Petrograd) became a Formalist bastion. Alternatively, one traveled to more forgiving economic climes. In 1922–23, Berlin boasted a vibrant Russian modernist community that drew sustenance from private Russian publishers catering to both Soviet and émigré markets. But this arrangement ended in 1924, when the stabilization of the German mark and growing Soviet reluctance to admit printed matter from abroad tipped the economic scales in favor of returning to Russia. Finally, unless their art

appealed to the mass consumer—like Sergei Esenin's poetry—modernists could follow the Formalist prescription of professionalism. Depending on their connections, some authors benefited from hackwork more than others. Maiakovskii, unlike most, enjoyed a steady stream of high honoraria for political propaganda and commercial ads commissioned by public agencies. The LEF's Constructivist theories legitimated his hackwork as a tool for revolutionizing the human psyche and thus contributing to the building of the new society (*zhiznestroitel'stvo*).[233] This recycling of the modernist fusion of art and life (*zhiznetvorchestvo*), whose end goal was the "revolution of the spirit," worked well enough as a form of self-justification. Nonmonetary perks conferred by patronage networks further mitigated market pressure, affording Maiakovskii and his coterie a privileged lifestyle in the USSR.[234]

But the Constructivist theory had its problems. Some Marxists interpreted it as the last gasp of the "bourgeois" cult of artistic autonomy.[235] Even more ominous for Maiakovskii was his perceived violation of the Formalist code of professionalism that distinguished "honest" hackwork—born of necessity and treated with self-conscious detachment—from mercantile art claiming to represent genuine values, as did Constructivism. In 1926, Chukovskii contrasted his own hackwork to the "spiritual prostitution" of painter Isaak Brodskii, whose art was as servile as Maiakovskii's.[236] As in Brodskii's case, Maiakovskii's visible material prosperity and political obsequiousness were exacerbated by ostensibly earnest hackwork. The poet's standing in modernist culture deteriorated accordingly.[237] Privately, Maiakovskii decried his eroding artistic autonomy and carped about the venality of Gosizdat editors who mistook his trademark verse segmentation for a financial ploy to fill more pages. In public, the poet's rants against "bourgeois" vestiges in Soviet society intensified in direct proportion to his growing welfare, as did his horror of the mundane (*byt*). Characteristically, Roman Jakobson defended his friend against émigré attacks, in the wake of Maiakovskii's suicide, by focusing on the most serious accusation of all, that the poet had betrayed the charismatic authorial ideal still dear to émigré modernists.[238]

The decision to stay in exile placed before modernists a different set of options. Like most émigré authors, aesthetics aside, they resorted to a combination of income sources—from literary professionalism to mutual aid societies to vestigial family fortunes and jobs outside the cultural sphere. Last but not least, émigré modernists relied on private patronage, which Nikolai Otsup described in 1932 as a "humiliating, insulting, useful, and requisite" aspect of modern literature.[239] The disparity in the sizes of the Soviet and

émigré markets placed writers in the USSR in a better position to make a living by the pen.[240] Émigrés could not support themselves by writing alone.[241] Settling in France, Russian authors of all aesthetic persuasions explored the option of private patronage, soliciting rich compatriots and the French elites. Resultant sponsorship took the form of cash handouts and stipends, public fundraisers, donations to mutual aid societies, and publishing subsidies.[242]

Unlike Berlin's Russian print industry, undone by its reliance on the Soviet market, émigré publishing in Paris, and elsewhere in Europe, depended on expatriate readers and on donors, individual and institutional (the Czech government, various French associations, émigré organizations, etc.). Paying readers, impoverished by exile, and fickle patrons could not guarantee the stability of print ventures that, unlike newspapers and illustrated weeklies, did not cater to the mass consumer. Hence the return of the thick journal, whose primacy in Russia Abroad had economic roots, contrary to the format's revival in the USSR as part of the Marxist appropriation of the intelligentsia's legacy. In exile, a highbrow periodical appealing to the broadest possible readership by sporting a range of discursive modes—fiction, philosophy, criticism, sociopolitical commentary, bibliography—was easier to finance than the specialized press.[243] Hence the longevity of thick journals, *Volia Rossii* (1920–32) and *Sovremennye zapiski* (1920–40), relative to the precariousness of modernist reviews—*Udar* (1922–23), *Versty* (1926–28), *Blagonamerennyi* (1926), *Novyi dom* (1926–27), *Novyi korabl'* (1927–28), *Stikhotvorenie* (1928), *Krug* (1936–38)—the most durable of which, the patron-funded *Chisla* (1930–34), came out irregularly.

Lacking the material benefits of state patronage, émigré modernists had all the more reason to flaunt their artistic autonomy, which became a rallying cry of the *Chisla* circle, against the backdrop of shrinking creative freedom in the USSR. Besides, younger modernists had little to gain economically from the émigré cultural mainstream, where age mattered more than aesthetics. In Russia Abroad, established artists, their aesthetics notwithstanding, enjoyed better access to publishers and patrons than those launching their careers abroad. For the former, professionalism meant the sale of literary fiction to émigré and foreign publishers. With a few exceptions, translation into foreign languages—a prized source of income, since foreign-language outlets paid better than émigré ones—was an option for older writers only.[244] The economic fragility of the émigré press forced older modernists under one editorial roof with their aesthetic antipodes, while the modernist cohort

maturing abroad had almost no access to publishing outlets in the 1920s.[245] For younger writers, then, literary professionalism meant, at best, editorial chores and journalism in the émigré press, neither ensuring economic self-sufficiency. Most younger modernists plied various trades—from cab-driving and clerical work to business, accounting, engineering, and medicine—or led a bohemian existence at the expense of family and friends. Isaac Babel cited their situation as a factor in his decision to remain "an upright Soviet citizen" during two stays in France (1927–28, 1932–33), thus preserving his ability to earn a living as a writer back home, even at the cost of losing his artistic autonomy in Stalinist culture.[246]

Exiled modernists made a virtue of necessity. They utilized their economic situation—which Dovid Knut described as "ideal conditions for [writing] lyrical poetry"—to forge a charismatic self-image grounded in the explicit rejection of professionalism.[247] Known today as the "unnoticed generation" of émigré literature, this ultimate Russian modernist cohort conceptualized its creative activity, heeding the self-stylization of its Western counterparts, as a feat of prodigious difficulty, accomplished, as Virginia Woolf concurrently put it, despite "every form of distraction and discouragement."[248] Émigrés cast their oeuvre as the purest expression of charismatic authorship, achieved through historical happenstance—exile placed them outside the economic and political temptations inherent in literary professionalism in the USSR and in the free cultural market in the West.[249] Expatriation, they argued, was the preferable choice for a Russian artist who held dear the charismatic authorial ideal.[250] This line of argument gained particular traction in the 1930s, in view of the Stalinist cooptation of cultural producers with material incentives.[251]

The Cultural Revolution in the USSR entailed an assault on a certain conception of charismatic authorship, one centered on artistic autonomy.[252] Marxists saw in it a threat to their own charismatic authorial model, wherein art was a form of service to party-approved causes, so that an artifact's originality and skill mattered less than its perceived agenda. Contingent on fluctuating party policies, this model rendered virtually impossible charismatic authorial self-stylization predicated on the creative subject's autonomy from external pressures. As a result, one's chances of joining the Stalinist literary pantheon greatly improved after death, as in Maiakovskii's case. Already in 1931, Mikhail Prishvin, whose literary career had taken him from the intelligentsia culture to modernism and back, noted that artistic autonomy had become a pipe dream in the USSR, because "the state and society had pro-

grammatically merged," making "poetry just a type of employment, like a collective farm or a factory."[253] At the same time, Marxist critics multiplied calls for the state's material intervention on behalf of artists, who indulged in "bohemian dreams of world conquest following the recipe of the Pushkinian 'poet'" (Reisner) thanks to their socioeconomic marginality and would give up charismatic delusions of grandeur in exchange for a useful role in society.[254] This line of reasoning reserved a special place in hell for private patronage as a "bourgeois" institution that kept writers under the spell of ideologically alien concepts, such as art's apolitical nature and its separation from the state.[255]

The NEP's end, in 1928, made state sponsorship inevitable for those wishing to be professional writers in the USSR. As the private share of the Soviet cultural market shrank (with only four nonstate imprints surviving in 1930, but not for long) and as access to publishing increasingly depended on the good critical graces of the RAPP's Marxist radicals, modernists feared for their literary livelihood.[256] Ginzburg's diary illuminates the economic situation of the dying modernist community. For the second time in a decade, she believed, the market made authors readjust their survival strategies. For her, this meant the abandonment of literary professionalism, including lucrative hackwork, whose appeal had diminished with the loss of the NEP-era option of writing mass-market pulp fiction with metaliterary winks at a modernist coterie. Loath to take the road of political servility, Ginzburg vaunted "a second profession that parodied the first," namely, her job as a literature instructor at a trade school, and other activities peripherally related to "serious" writing yet ostensibly untainted by conformism (e.g., children's literature). "Serious" writing had reverted, in Ginzburg's view, to a premodern amateur pastime contingent on leisure and inspiration, and indifferent to publishing prospects.[257]

Unlike Ginzburg—or Mandel'shtam and Akhmatova, whom I discuss later—most modernists flocked to state-funded professionalism. Their move was facilitated by Stalinist rhetoric, which offered its own interpretation of artistic autonomy whereby participation in the Marxist project to deliver humanity from liberal capitalist modernity removed contradictions between state power and cultural creativity. Not only did the ultimate goals of modernism and Marxism seem to overlap, but writers in the USSR had already been delivered, according to Stalinist ideologues, from the capitalist market.[258] By this logic, the patron-state was on art's side in its quest for economic autonomy, whose price—political loyalty—appeared small indeed as

long as one agreed that the Marxist project subsumed a core aspect of the modernist sensibility—the dream of the "revolution of the spirit." The 1932 reform of the Soviet cultural market accelerated the cooptation of modernists, who welcomed the momentary ideological thaw and newfound access to positions of authority in the state's cultural apparatus.[259] The reform promised more creative license and better prospects for making a living by the pen, since the state showed readiness to fund cultural production on a large scale. All this revived the old modernist hopes for state-sponsored artistic autonomy at little cost to intellectual and aesthetic integrity. Such hopes were promptly dashed, however, and initial enthusiasm gave way to resigned conformism as the imposition of Socialist Realism breathed new life into official anti-modernist campaigns.[260]

Whatever their private misgivings about lost creative freedom, Soviet writers embraced their post-1932 privileges.[261] Former modernist paragons of artistic autonomy basked in the economic windfall and in their improved social status as writers.[262] In 1936, Chukovskii noted, "My well-being has quadrupled in the past five years."[263] Contemporaries recorded similarly dramatic "embourgeoisement" in Tynianov's lifestyle.[264] Despite general material penury in the USSR, the condition of cultural producers approached that of the country's military, administrative, and industrial elites, boasting high incomes, priority housing, better medical care, special stores, and exclusive resorts.[265] Unfree in artistic methods and themes, coopted modernists were ostensibly free from the pressure of the market. Even honoraria were now based not on sales but on print runs determined by the Writers' Union according to its own hierarchy of privilege.[266]

Ironically, modernists struck this Faustian bargain with a Stalinist culture programmatically oriented toward the mass consumer, as duly noted by émigré critics.[267] The enviable socioeconomic condition of Soviet writers was the fruit of commerce with the mass market, mediated by the patron-state. The latter obscured the monetary aspect of an artist's rapport with the public and regulated what kinds of artifacts could reach the market. Socialist Realism enshrined this obfuscation of market relations in the requirement of art's accessibility as the realization of the intelligentsia's dream to take high culture to the masses. At the First Congress of Soviet Writers (1934), speaker after speaker contrasted the high-cultural mission of Soviet writers to Western literary professionals as slaves of mass-consumer tastes.[268]

Competition persisted in the Soviet cultural market, but in a veiled form—as the hierarchy of privilege enforced by the bureaucracy of artists'

unions. That hierarchy was mediated by party patrons, with Stalin as the ultimate Maecenas, whose protection allowed Pasternak to publish twenty books in the 1930s–40s, with a total print run of two hundred thousand copies, compared to nine books in the 1910s–20s, with a print run of thirty thousand.[269] Stalin presided over a vast client network, communicating with authors, attending to their personal and professional needs, meting out punishment, and adjudicating conflicts.[270] Other officials—Bukharin, Enukidze, Ezhov, Voroshilov, Tukhachevskii—also ran patronage networks, albeit less powerful ones.[271] The gloating of Soviet cultural producers at the news of repression or censure befalling a colleague reflected the persistence of market competition, since a rival's failure opened possibilities for one's own success.[272]

The condition of artists in Stalinist culture resembled premodern patronage relations. Back in the 1920s, Maiakovskii struggled to disprove the association of his politically servile verse with the odic genre favored by Russia's eighteenth-century poets.[273] A decade later, Socialist Realism, berated in émigré criticism as a premodern aesthetic, revived similarly antiquated institutional practices.[274] Thus, explaining Socialist Realism to an American modernist, Sergei Eisenstein cast his own situation as "parallel to that of the early Italian artists who were obliged to paint New Testament subjects, crucifixion scenes, or portraits of the Virgin Mary, over and over again as propaganda for the Church, yet performed their task with effects of infinite variety and beauty."[275] In a similar vein, observing that "literature as creative activity" had been replaced by "a special form of state service," Ginzburg could not miss parallels with art as a state career in seventeenth-century France and in eighteenth-century Russia, whose patronage systems, comprehensive and personalized in their approach to the welfare and social status of artists, uncannily resembled the dynamic between cultural producers and the Stalinist patron-state.[276]

This dynamic problematized the status of Soviet writers as literary professionals, at least in the concept's modern sense, since they now addressed, above all, not the paying public but the party-state apparatus. Consider Mikhail Bulgakov's commentary on his condition as an artist in a 1936 play about Molière, whose reliance on Louis XIV's patronage allegorized Bulgakov's debt to Stalin. The play's proscription speaks not to Bulgakov's subversive intent (working on *Molière*, he was also planning an open theatrical panegyric to Stalin) but to Marxist discomfort vis-à-vis similarities between Stalinist culture, touted as the cutting edge of modernity, and its premodern

analogues.[277] Finally, replacing the notion of artistic autonomy as freedom from all external pressure with autonomy as economic freedom from the market in exchange for political loyalty, Stalinism erased the distinction between "honest" hackwork and "spiritual prostitution" that had justified literary professionalism in modernist culture. This replacement, part of the larger Stalinist recoding of charismatic authorship, informed the theoretical debunking of literary professionalism by the consummate professional Bulgakov, whose writer-hero in *The Master and Margarita* (1940) adamantly opposed the "writer" designation as a marker of professionalism, unwittingly echoing the contemporary eulogy to literary dilettantism in Nabokov's *The Gift* (1937–38).[278]

Among veteran modernists in Stalin's USSR, such rejection of literary professionalism informed Akhmatova's resistance to the "littérateur" status, which she pinned disapprovingly on Pasternak, who vainly cajoled her to join the Writers' Union.[279] Incidentally, Pasternak aired his belated discontent with Stalinism by vicariously indulging in the cult of literary dilettantism, practiced by the eponymous hero of *Doctor Zhivago* (1956). The same distaste for professionalism informed Mandel'shtam's shuttling between the urge to "abandon literature" and the desire to make a living by the pen, even as a member of the Writers' Union.[280] Struggling to live up to his charismatic ideal in the pragmatic NEP era, the poet experienced the advent of Stalinism as propitious to charismatic self-stylization. "Poetry is power," he told Akhmatova in Voronezh exile—the price of his epigram on Stalin whose consequences seemed to validate Mandel'shtam's belief in poetry's enduring authority.[281] At the same time, Mandel'shtam sought protection in patronage networks around party officials, accepting the material benefits of such protection and fighting for a better place in the hierarchy of privilege within the Writers' Union. But the patron-state's largesse discombobulated the would-be poet-prophet who thrived on confrontation and flaunted his scorn for everyday comforts (*byt*).[282] Asserting his artistic autonomy, Mandel'shtam alternated bouts of political irreverence with attempts to court party benefactors. Among these attempts was an ode to Stalin whose earnestness, in Ginzburg's estimate, was striking when compared to Akhmatova's forced poetic eulogy to the supreme patron.[283] Mandel'shtam's conduct ultimately proved fatal, but this does not change the fact that the poet saw himself as a charismatic rival rather than victim of political power.

Nor is Akhmatova's case as clear-cut as her personal mythology of victimhood and defiance has it. Like Mandel'shtam's, her conduct was informed

by the modernist sensibility predating Lenin's coup. Akhmatova did not just accept the perks proffered by the Marxist state: she was adamant that a poet of her stature was entitled to socioeconomic privilege.[284] At the same time, her charismatic ideal and aspiration to sponsored artistic autonomy gave Akhmatova's self-presentation an "affinity with the totalitarian discourse of her oppressors," as Zholkovsky argues in his analysis of the poet's "paradoxical opposition/symbiosis" with Stalin as the supreme villain and patron at once—an imaginary combat that kept Akhmatova's "charismatic batteries charged," much like Mandel'shtam's.[285] No wonder Stalinist literary official Konstantin Simonov took off his state decorations before visiting Akhmatova, in the late 1930s, as if to confirm her status as a spiritual rival to political authority.[286]

The political economy of Russian modernism sets it apart in transnational modernist experience. Take Marina Mackay's investigation of late modernism in Britain as a socioeconomic formation held together by family ties and steeped in class privilege. Mackay synchronizes the decline of British modernism with the post-1945 rise of the welfare state, eroding the modernist community's economic foundations and its birthright position near the centers of political power.[287] Russian experience belies Mackay's logic, since the disintegration of modernist culture in the USSR went hand in hand with its rapprochement with political authority, embodied by the patron-state. Nor can students of Russian modernism separate politics from economics as easily as did George Orwell in his 1945 reflection on the institution of authorship in Western Europe: "In this place I do not want to express an opinion either for or against State patronage of the arts, but merely to point out that *what kind* of State rules over us must depend partly on the prevailing intellectual atmosphere: meaning, in this context, partly on the attitude of writers and artists themselves, and on their willingness or otherwise to keep the spirit of liberalism alive. If we find ourselves in ten years' time cringing before somebody like Zhdanov, it will probably be because that is what we have deserved."[288] In interwar Russian modernist experience, in fact, economics and politics were so tightly intertwined that the latter-day expressions of guilt by veteran modernists bemoaning their community's cooptation by the Marxist state took on economic connotations, roughly along the following lines: "We feasted while the country burned."[289] Material benefits proffered by a patronizing agency were desirable precisely because they validated authorial charisma by reflecting its high social status, so that few exponents of Russian modernist culture could fully resist the Stalinist re-

coding of artistic autonomy as economic independence from the commercial and homogenizing mass-cultural market, courtesy of the patron-state. Hence also the attendant tendency to exaggerate material privations and resistance to the state among those modernists whom memoir writers wanted to cast as the Soviet regime's charismatically righteous victims.[290] Orwell's theme of just deserts would certainly skew our cartography of the Russian modernist terrain.

Orwell's polemical judgmentalism, understandable for his time and place, foreshadowed the late-Soviet dissident discourse—in the memoirs of Nadezhda Mandel'shtam (1970–72) and in the monographs on Iurii Olesha by Arkadii Belinkov (1976) and on Vladimir Maiakovskii by Iurii Karabchievskii (1983)—which castigated the political accommodation of the Marxist state by modernists as a manifestation of their noncharismatic thirst for socioeconomic privilege. As the apportioning of blame for Russia's tragic twentieth century migrated from the dissident discourse to post-Soviet historiography, the pendulum—in the works of Igor' Golomshtok, Boris Groys, Hans Günther, Irina Gutkin—swung from the traditional view of modernist culture as a victim of its Marxist rival to insistence on modernism's complicity in Russia's Communist experiment. For all its theoretical sophistication, though, this scholarly literature conveys the same sense of disenchantment with fallen charismatic idols one finds in Belinkov's morality tale about Olesha's literary career and in Karabchievskii's equally damning ethical verdict on Maiakovskii's artistic trajectory. Following in the footsteps of late-Soviet dissidence, this post-Soviet scholarly tradition slides imperceptibly from a historical study of a cultural community toward a moralistic value judgment. Thus, our cultural cartography of Russian modernism remains a didactic exercise in monster depiction familiar to old mapmakers, who drew fabulous creatures in spots for which little topographic information was available, occasionally outfitting their charts with an eloquent but ultimately uninformative legend—*Hic sunt dracones*, here be dragons.

My book, in contrast, has aimed to launch a discussion about transforming Russian modernist studies from a domain largely preoccupied with perpetuating old cultural myths and creating new ones to serve evolving ideological agendas into an academic field that charts the historical experience of a cultural community in all its contradictory variety and on the basis of available factual evidence. To repeat Joseph Conrad's cartographic considerations, cited in the introduction, it is high time to leave behind the "geog-

raphy fabulous" and "geography militant" of Russian modernism, and try other ways of thinking and speaking about this cultural formation in the hope that, one day, its study may become, like "the business of map-making" Conrad mused about, "an honest occupation, registering the hard-won knowledge, but also in a scientific spirit recording [our] ignorance."[291]

Conclusion

This book advocates for a methodological shift in the focus of modernist studies: from their preoccupation with (re-)defining modernism to an inquiry into modernism's uses as an analytical tool facilitating the study of cultural processes and their participants. In my conceptual framework, which strives to describe rather than define its object of investigation, the term and concept of modernism refer, at once, to an evolving system of values, ideas, practices, and conventions informing human experience with meaning, and to individuals sharing in this transnational cognitive system, which held together for about half a century the geographically dispersed and intellectually disparate community I call Russian modernist culture. In my usage, then, modernism does not designate an immutable quality characterizing authors or artifacts. Instead, it signals their appurtenance to a cultural community and denotes the meanings given by that community to some ideas and practices but not to others. Furthermore, calling individuals, artifacts, practices, or ideas modernist, I indicate their place in modernist culture at a specific historical moment. For this place is fleeting: no idea or practice is exclusive to modernism, and few individuals or artifacts retain their central position in a modernist community throughout its existence.

The conceptual approach explored in this book is the idea of modernism as a minority culture that coexists and interacts with other cultural formations in a given historical time and geographic space. Such an approach presupposes an interdisciplinary methodology that looks beyond artistic and philosophical expression, accounting for modernism's socioeconomic and institutional life. It also broadens the academic field's purview to include cultural mediators and consumers, contrary to the traditional focus of modernist studies on cultural producers. I argue that modernist culture, national or transnational, functions as an interpretive community whose members

bestow a range of shared meanings on human experience, even as their cognitive system evolves in response to historical circumstances and rival interpretive communities. Russian modernism changed so much over its lifetime that the principal reason for speaking about its fifty-year history resides in the sense of continuity professed by the community's self-identified members. The specificity of the Russian case in transnational modernist context consists in the extreme demographic and geographic fluctuation of Russia's modernist community thanks to the country's turbulent twentieth-century history.

Throughout the book, I have shown the methodological advantages of reshaping modernist studies as an inquiry into a culture. One such benefit resides in our newfound ability to complement the writing of modernist history as a succession of canonical works and authors with the exploration of modernism in space and time as a story of a cultural community's gestation, evolution, and decline. Another benefit of the proposed conceptual reframing is the enhanced ability of researchers to take critical distance from their object of investigation. As the book's first chapter demonstrates, the common terminology of Russian modernist studies, rooted in the partisan agendas and factional debates of modernism's exponents and foes, can become a structuring principle of academic inquiry, forcing scholars to adopt the biased logic of their material. The book's second chapter shows that the same logic obtains in the classification criteria we use to distinguish modernist authors and artifacts from non-modernist ones. Our taxonomy relies on the extant definitions of modernism, mired in the partisan agendas of their creators and drawing our attention to some authors and practices at the expense of others.

The latter problem is especially acute in Russian modernist studies thanks to their traditionally politicized nature. As the book's first three chapters show, the increasingly irrelevant political considerations informing the contrastive "pre-Soviet/Soviet/anti-Soviet" paradigm, which has been shaping Russian cultural historiography for almost a century, obfuscate an entire series of unresolved issues in modernist classification, chronology, periodization, and geography. In contrast, my conceptual approach strives to depoliticize modernist studies without downplaying the importance of politics in modernist experience. Discarding the stock narrative about modernists as idealistic or opportunistic political fellow travelers, I view them as autonomous actors pursuing their own interests and goals in competition with rival cultural formations. Accordingly, the book's fourth chapter examines mod-

ernism through the lens of its mutually defining rapport with Russia's other cultures of modernity, while the final chapter delves, among other things, into the modernist community's political economy in the Soviet and émigré subsystems of the Russian field of cultural production.

The theoretical model of Russian modernism emerging from the book's five chapters—and which, I hope, can serve as a conceptual tool aiding the study of other national modernist traditions—is that of a cultural space with a core and a periphery, periodically overlapping with rival cultural formations thanks to shared ideas, myths, values, practices, and participants. This space evolves in response to new cohorts of cultural producers and consumers, who renew modernism's dominant (core) values, ideas, and practices, modifying the relative distribution of its actors. Pushed from their central position, older values, ideas, and practices continue to coexist with newly dominant ones for as long as their carriers stay within the modernist community, albeit on its periphery. No actor occupies a fixed position in the cultural space of Russian modernism, where doctrinal purity is a fleeting quality contingent on one's intellectual and aesthetic proximity to the culture's mutating radical core.

Like its composition, the shape of Russian modernism's cultural space also evolves: in part, thanks to the fluctuating public reception of modernist ideas and artifacts, which brings about the community's demographic expansion and contraction, and, in part, due to changing sociopolitical circumstances, which trigger the community's westward migration and cause its demise in the USSR a decade before its end in Russia Abroad. In tandem with its fluctuating geography and demographics, examined in the third chapter, the evolution of Russian modernism's core values and practices allows for the culture's alternative historical chronologies, with one such tentative timeline—early, high, and late Russian modernism—developed throughout this book.

Probably the most consequential methodological advantage of thinking modernism as a cultural community consists in the variety of analytical vantages opened by the notion of culture itself. This variety of perspectives permits the writing of modernist history as a series of complementary, and even contradictory, stories. Applying different thematic filters to a national modernist culture, one augments the importance of certain events and personalities that are overlooked when we treat modernist history in exclusionary canonical terms. Such multiplicity of perspectives has led me to cartography as the controlling metaphor for the methodological revision of

modernist studies advocated in this book. Like cartography, whose production of usable maps requires selection, simplification, enhancement, and other tools yielding different stories about the same physical terrain, students of modernism, I venture, could explore multiple histories, or maps, of their research object. Each map, governed by its thematic filter, would render visible some actors, practices, and events from the life of a modernist community, while obscuring others. Brought together, into a historical atlas of sorts, all such stories would offer a much richer than hitherto possible description of a national or transnational modernist culture.

Naturally, my advocacy of modernist studies as an atlas-like project in cultural cartography—highlighting different aspects of a geographically circumscribed cultural space over a period of historical time—implies a long-term, group scholarly effort. This book tests only two of the many possible thematic filters that can be productively applied to modernist experience. After a critical revision of our mental cartography of Russian modernism—a remapping that occupies the book's first three chapters, I chart, in chapter 4, modernism's interrelations with Russia's intelligentsia, Marxist, and mass cultures, from the 1890s to 1940, with an eye on the interpretive potential of this sociological approach. The book's final chapter applies another, economic filter to modernist experience. It explores the heuristic potential of studying Russian modernism in its evolving economic context.

The book's limited scope is an invitation to researchers in Russian and transnational modernism to contribute other stories/maps to the same historical atlas. Russian modernist studies sport a plethora of unexplored research venues, whose list is too long to cite here. I will name but a few thematic filters that can be fruitfully applied to modernist experience. Take, for example, the subject cluster "Russian modernism and its publics," which could generate valuable maps of the modernist cultural space: from the history of the reception of modernist practices to the public self-fashioning of modernists in the context of their culture's dominant racial and gender attitudes. Another thematic filter is "Russian modernism and cultural institutions." Here one could investigate the role of the periodical press and publishing houses in the evolution of the modernist community, the construction of authorial reputations in and by that community, the typology and functions of the modernist community's social networks, and so forth. But the most glaring omission in my study, dictated by the need to curtail its length, is Russian modernism's transnational context.

Russian modernism lends itself to very productive investigations as part

of a larger cultural space. This space could be delimited by the regions historically under Russian political domination, in which case one would study, for instance, the interrelations of the Russian-speaking modernist community with its Ukrainian, Yiddish, Georgian, or Polish counterparts. One could also examine Russian modernism in its wider European context, mapping out the changing interactions, mutual influences, affinities, and divergences of national modernist communities. I believe the conceptual approach elaborated in this monograph facilitates transnational approaches in modernist studies. And I sincerely hope that a number of such comparative investigations appear as a result of the debate this book strives to provoke.

Some readers may be frustrated by the fact that my book does not propose a coherent revisionist picture of Russian modernist experience, or a fresh definition of modernism, or a fixed theoretical framework. It is my belief that no such overarching historical narrative, definition, or set framework are possible, or indeed desirable, given the state of Russian modernist studies. Instead, I have reopened to critical questioning the field's methodological assumptions, doubting the soundness of the analytical tools at our disposal and suggesting alternatives to conventional ways of thinking Russian modernism. My primary goal is to spark a discussion by challenging the accepted ideas and stock practices in Russian modernist studies. Instead of a fixed theoretical framework, I am proposing a common conceptual denominator for the multiplicity of vantage points I urge my colleagues in modernist studies to adopt. This common denominator—the vision of modernism, national or transnational, as a cultural community existing in a given geographic space and historical time—transforms the field of modernist studies into a project in cultural cartography, with Russian modernism among its least explored terrains whose embarrassment of riches, hidden in plain sight, never fails to reward investigators with a deeper understanding of transnational modernist experience. Hence the title of this book. Hence also my hope that the ensuing scholarly debate will enable us to follow the numerous poorly explored paths in the investigation of Russian and transnational modernist cultures.

Notes

Introduction

1. Rougle, "Recent Soviet Approaches," 387–400. Tall, "Soviet Debate," 8–19.

2. Gibian, introduction to Gibian and Tjalsma, *Russian Modernism*, 9–10.

3. Peterson, *History*, xi. Rosenthal and Bohachevsky-Chomiak, *Revolution*, ix. For Soviet polemics against modernist studies abroad, see S. Nebol'sin, "Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii russkogo modernizma v otsenkakh sovremennogo burzhuaznogo literaturovedeniia Zapada," in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 373–405.

4. Reitblat, "'<. . .> chto blestit'?," 249–51.

5. Loewen, "Twentieth-Century Russian Literature," 172–86.

6. Belyi, "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," 38–9. Khodasevich, "O simvolizme" (1928), *Literaturnye stat'i*, 155.

7. See Fëdor Dviniatin, "Nabokov, modernizm, postmodernizm i mimesis," in Leving and Soshkin, *Imperiia N*, 442–4.

8. Perry Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," in Nelson and Grossberg, *Marxism*, 332.

9. Nabokov's annotations to *Eugene Onegin*, 3: 32–3.

10. Josipovici, *World*, 179.

11. Bourdieu, "The Market of Symbolic Goods," *Field*, 112–41.

12. Gombrich, "Norm and Form," *Norm*, 81–2. Malia, *Soviet Tragedy*, 48–9. Payne, *History*, 4.

13. Frye, "The Drunken Boat," *Romanticism*, 1–2. McHale, *Postmodernist Fiction*, 4–5.

14. See, for example, Deborah Jacobs, "Feminist Criticism/Cultural Studies/Modernist Texts: A Manifesto for the '90s," in Rado, *Rereading*, 273–95.

15. Nemoianu, *Taming*, vii. See also Furst, *Romanticism*, 1–13.

16. Friedman, "Definitional Excursions," 493–513. Thompson, *Fiction*, 13.

17. Boris Tomashevskii, "Formal'nyi metod," in Ivanov-Razumnik, *Sovremennaia literatura*, 148.

18. Löwy and Sayre, *Révolte*, 13, 25, 29. McHale, *Postmodernist Fiction*, 7.

19. Cantor, *Twentieth-Century Culture*, 35–41.

20. Wachtel and Vinitsky, *Russian Literature*, 158–9.

21. Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," 322–3. Levenson, *Modernism*, 1.

22. Gay, *Freud*, 26–7. Howe, "The Culture of Modernism," *Decline*, 4–6. Robert Wohl, "The Generation of 1914 and Modernism," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 68–74.

23. Williams, *Culture*, 35, 63–85. See also Corbett and Thacker, "Raymond Williams," 84–106.

24. Gasparov, introduction to Gasparov, Hughes, and Paperno, *Cultural Mythologies*, 1–2. Cooper, *Modernism*, 28. Turner, *Marketing*, 6–7.

25. Geertz, *Interpretation*, 3–30.

26. Adamovich, "Ob M. Kuzmine," 2. Belyi, "Detskaia svistul'ka," 58; "Venok," 1–4; "O simvolizme," 10; "Problema kul'tury" (1909), *Simvolizm*, 8–10. Briusov, "Sviashchennaia zhertva," 29. Khodasevich, "Konets Renaty," *Nekropol'*, 19–21; "O simvolizme," 156–57. Pasternak, *Okhrannaia gramota* (1931), *Vozdushnye puti*, 272–3. Tret'iakov, "Otkuda i kuda?," 192–203.

27. Dorovatovskii and Charushnikov, *Ocherki*, v.

28. Red'ko, *Literaturno-khudozhestvennye iskaniia*, 142–3.

29. V. Bakulin [Briusov], "Torzhestvo," 55. Fedotov, "Bor'ba," 38–9. Oksenov, "Pis'ma," 30. Visan, "L'Idéal," 194, 198. "V zhurnalakh.—Russkii vestnik," 71.

30. Vengerov, "Etapy neo-romanticheskogo dvizheniia," *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 18–19.

31. Zhirmunskii, *Valerii Briusov*, 6. See also Mannheim, "The Problem of Generations" (1923), *Essays*, 315–18.

32. Stepun, "Porevoliutsionnoe soznanie," 15–16.

33. Khodasevich, "O simvolizme," 155.

34. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 27. See also Belyi, "Simvolizm kak miroponimanie," 175–6.

35. A. Bëm to E. Chegrintseva (20 July 1940), in Malevich, "Vokrug 'Skita,'" 188.

36. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (11 July 1926), 1. Belyi, "Pevitsa," 302–3. Briusov, "Bal'mont," 29–30. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1950–1960-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 214. Osip Mandel'shtam, *Shum vremeni*, *Sochineniia*, 2: 15, 41–2. "Ot redaktsii," *Chisla* 1 (1930), 5–6. Terapiano, "Chelovek," 210.

37. Dmitrii Segal, "O vozmozhnoi tipologii 'serebrianykh vekov,'" in Lanne, *Âge*, 7.

38. Bachinskii, "*Fakely*," 82. Bogomolov, "Proekt 'Akmeizm,'" 170.

39. Kermode, *History*, 125, 143. Latour, *We Have Never Been Modern*, 47.

40. Cavanagh, *Osip Mandelstam*, 4.

41. Constable, Denisoff, and Potolsky, *Perennial Decay*, 12. Griffin, *Modernism*, 45, 51–2. Osborne, *Politics*, ix–x, 8–9.

42. Veidle, "Bor'ba," 438–9.

43. See M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism*, 13. Barthes, *Mythologies*, 215. Eliade, *Aspects*, 12–32.

44. Boym, *Common Places*, 67–8. Abbott Gleason, "The Terms of Russian Social History," in Clowes, Kassow, and West, *Between Tsar*, 17. Nahirny, *Russian Intelligentsia*, 10–11. Hugh Seton-Watson, "The Russian Intellectuals," in Huszar, *Intellectuals*, 48.

45. Hans Günther, "Geroi v totalitarnoi kul'ture," in Gassner, *Agitatsiia*, 71–2. Redman, *Ezra Pound*, 100–20. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *New Myth*, 312–13, 326.

46. Calinescu, *Five Faces*, 42–5. Graña, *Bohemian*, 63. Martin-Fugier, *Romantiques*, 230–2.

47. Pasternak, *Okhrannaia gramota*, 273.

48. Anichkov, *Realizm*, 57. Arabazhin, *Etiudy*, 174. Andrei Belyi, "Kharakteristiki sovremennikov," in Lavrov, *Andrei Belyi*, 427. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nat Pinkerton i sovremennaia literatura" (1908), *Kniga*, 60–3; "Dzhek London," *Litsa*, 149–50; diary (20 January 1923), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 231. Chulkov, "Marinetti," *Nashi sputniki*, 181–2. Vladimir Gippius, "O novoi tochke zreniia," 21–4. Grossman-Roshchin, "Sotsial'nyi zamysel," 115–16. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Skifskii manifest" (1917), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 1: 23–5. Merezhkovskii, "Griadushchii kham" (1906); "Tsvety meshchanstva" (1908), *V tikhom omute*, 71–7, 366–76. Volynskii, "Predislovie," *Bor'ba*, ii–iii. Zelinskii, "Konstruktivizm i sotsializm," in Zelinskii and Sel'vinskii, *Biznes*, 59. See also Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1930), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 92. Maksimov, "'Severnyi vestnik' i simvolisty," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 103. Vikentii Veresaev, "Vospominaniia o Leonide Andreeve," in Andreev and Beklemisheva, *Rekviem*, 163–4.

49. Kornei Chukovskii, "Leonid Andreev," *Ot Chekhova*, 245–6; "Russkaia literatura <v 1907 godu>" (1908), *Sobranie*, 6: 552.

50. "Budetlianin nauki," in Jangfeldt, *Iakobson*, 69. K. Chukovskii to N. Chukovskii (April 1924), in N. Chukovskii, *O tom*, 381–2. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 33–4, 47, 209. Tret'iakov, "Otkuda i kuda?," 193–4. See also Boym, *Common Places*, 30–7. Bronner, *Modernism*, 7–11. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 14–15. Mikhail Vaiskopf, "Mif Iakobsona o Maiakovskom," in Gindin, Grintser, and Shumilova, *Materialy*, 210–11. Walker, *Maximilian Voloshin*, 14–15. Williams, *Politics*, 53–7.

51. Daly, *Modernism*, 118.

52. V. Bazarov, "Avtoritarnaia metafizika i avtonomnaia lichnost'," in Dorovatovskii and Charushnikov, *Ocherki*, 252. Nikolai Berdiaev, "Predsmertnye mysli Fausta," in *Zakat Evropy*, 65–7. Kornei Chukovskii, "Chekhov i proletarstvuiushchee meshchanstvo" (1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 531–2. Ivanov-Razumnik, *God*, vii, 64. Khodasevich to Gorky (28 April 1923), *Sobranie*, 4: 460–1. Merezhkovskii, "Meshchanstvo," 33–6.

Minskii, "Sotsial-gumanizm," *Na obshchestvennye temy*, 61–72. Pentaur, "*Ocherki*," 74–5.

53. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 76, 159. Berdiaev, "Revoliutsiia," 146–55. Filosofov, "Natsionalizm," 210–11. V. Friche, "Osnovnye motivy zapadno-evropeiskogo modernizma," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 2: 229–30. Ianovskii [Belyi], "Literaturnyi raspad," 71–2. Lunacharskii, *Religiia*, 2: 210; *Ot Spinozy*, 122–3. Plekhanov, "Predislovie k tret'emu izdaniiu sbornika 'Za dvadtsat' let'" (1908); "Evangelie ot dekadansa" (1909), *Literatura*, 1: 125–6, 2: 468–79. Iu. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 1: 5, 11, 13. Vorovskii, "O burzhuaznosti modernistov" (1908), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 197–201. See also the Andreev-Gorky correspondence (2–4 December 1901, 12 September 1907, 21–23 March 1908), *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 113–14, 296–7, 307–8.

54. Berdiaev, *Filosofiia*, 151. Sergei Bulgakov, "Geroizm i podvizhnichestvo," in *Vekhi*, 28–9. Kornei Chukovskii, "Tretii sort," *Ot Chekhova*, 148. Pavel Miliukov, "Intelligentsiia i istoricheskaia traditsiia," in *Intelligentsiia v Rossii*, 95.

55. Fitzpatrick, *Tear Off the Masks!*, 29–85.

56. Averbakh, "Trevoga bol'nogo pisatelia," in Shaginian and Averbakh, *Pisatel'*, 35–6. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 193, 672, 765, 774–81. Viacheslav Polonskii, "O Maiakovskom" (1930), *O literature*, 220. Shaginian, "Trevoga," in Shaginian and Averbakh, *Pisatel'*, 5–7. Trotskii, "K. Chukovskii" (1923), *Literatura*, 276–9. B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 223, 234–5. "Rech' A. Ia. Aroseva," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s"ezd*, 280–1. Reisner, "Bogema," 89–90. Tal'nikov, "Literaturnye zametki," 193–4, 198. See also Figes and Kolonitskii, *Interpreting*, 153–90. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 2–18.

57. Khodasevich to B. Diatropov (9 July 1922), *Sobranie*, 4: 447–8. Miliukov, *Ocherki*, 2: 329.

58. Bogdanov, *Krasnaia zvezda* (1905), *Krasnaia zvezda*, 13–15. Gor'kii, "Zametki o meshchanstve" (1905), *Sobranie*, 23: 341–54. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Chto takoe intelligentsiia*, 16–30; "Skifskii manifest," 23–5. See also Banerjee, *We Modern People*, 142–52. On the interpenetration of the intelligentsia Populism and the modernist sensibility, see Anichkov, "Poslednie pobegi," 106–7. Kornei Chukovskii's diary (23 May 1927), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 402. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 277–8. Prishvin, "Okhota za schast'em" (1926), *Sobranie*, 3: 18.

59. Berdiaev, "Revoliutsiia," 149–55. Kornei Chukovskii, "Meshchanin protiv meshchanstva" (1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 454–5. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.3: 58–9, 66–7. Lelevich, "Vladimir Maiakovskii," 136–7. Plekhanov, "Predislovie k tret'emu izdaniiu sbornika 'Za dvadtsat' let,'" 125–6. Shteinman, "Novye vremena," 154–9.

60. P. Bade, "Art and Degeneration"; N. Stepan, "Biological Degeneration"; S. Gilman, "Political Theory and Degeneration"; conclusion to Chamberlin and Gilman, *Degeneration*, 97–114, 165–93, 236, 290. Griffin, *Modernism*, 55–6. Payne, *History*,

8–9. Pick, *Faces*, 8–15, 230–1. Volker Roelcke, "Electrified Nerves, Degenerated Bodies," in Gijswijt-Hofstra and Porter, *Cultures*, 185–92. Turda, *Modernism*, 24–5.

61. Beer, *Renovating*, 35–40, 202–9. Silverman, *Art Nouveau*, 9–10, 78–84.

62. Glinskii, "Bolezn′," 618–55. N. Mikhailovskii, "Russkoe otrazhenie frantsuzskogo simvolizma" (1893), *Literaturnaia kritika*, 359, 373. Stasov, "Iskusstvo XIX veka," *Izbrannye sochineniia*, 3: 659.

63. Dorovatovskii and Charushnikov, *Ocherki*, v–vi. "Vmesto predisloviia"; Iu. Steklov, "Sotsial′no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," in *Literaturnyi raspad* 1: 3, 14, 20. Friche, "Osnovnye motivy zapadno-evropeiskogo modernizma," 227–30. Samartsev, "Po tu storonu," 111–19. M. Gorky, A. Zhdanov, I. Erenburg, and K. Radek, in Luppol, Rozental′, and Tret′iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s′′ezd*, 1–4, 182–3, 291, 370. See also Gorsuch, *Youth*, 12–14. Papernyi, *Kul′tura*, 93–4.

64. Ianovskii [Belyi], "Literaturnyi raspad," 69–70. Merezhkovskii, "O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniiakh sovremennoi russkoi literatury" (1892–93), *Izbrannye stat′i*, 250–89; "L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii" (1902), *L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii*, 349–50. Rozanov, "Opavshie list′ia. Korob vtoroi" (1915), *Mysli*, 333–4. Volynskii, *Russkie kritiki*, 765.

65. Belous, *Vol′fila*, 2: 234–5. Belyi to Ivanov-Razumnik (19 November 1923), in Belous, *Vol′fila*, 2: 348. Frid, "Pol′ Valeri," 158. Gal′perina, "Marsel′ Prust," 153–4, 171–7. Kuznetsov, "Sotsialisticheskii realizm," 220. Miller-Budnitskaia, "Ob 'Ulisse,'" 179. Shteinberg, *Druz′ia*, 44–6. Startsev, "Dzheims Dzhois," 5.

66. Ferrall, *Modernist Writing*, 19–20. Griffin, *Modernism*, 171–5. Groys, "Nitssheanskie temy," 108. Günther, "Geroi v totalitarnoi kul′ture," 71–2; "Totalitarnoe gosudarstvo kak sintez iskusstv," in Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 12–13. Herf, *Reactionary Modernism*, 13, 49–50. Gilbert Merlio, "The Critique of Liberal Democracy in the Works of Oswald Spengler," in Sternhell, *Intellectual Revolt*, 184–5. Pick, *Faces*, 26, 54, 104, 234.

67. N. Smirnov, "Solntse," 267. See also Bazarov, "O. Shpengler i ego kritiki," 229–30. Piatakov, "Filosofiia," 186, 194–5.

68. Adamovich, "Literaturnye zametki" (19 May 1924; 17 November 1924), 2; "Literaturnye besedy" (17 August 1925; 11 July 1926), 1–2; "Otsenki," 2; "Nesostoiavshaiasia progulka," 294. Berdiaev, *Filosofiia*, 223, 226–7. Fedotov, "Chetverodnevnyi Lazar′," 140. Mochul′skii, "Literaturnye besedy" (16 February 1925), 2. Fedor Stepun, "Osval′d Shpengler i Zakat Evropy"; Semën Frank, "Krizis zapadnoi kul′tury"; Nikolai Berdiaev, "Predsmertnye mysli Fausta," in *Zakat Evropy*, 32–72.

69. M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism*, 313–24.

70. Crook, *Modernist Radicalism*, 26–9. Gentile, *Struggle*, 1, 44, 181. Griffin, *Modernism*, 55–69, 91, 338–9. Herf, *Reactionary Modernism*, 13, 224–5. Osborne, *Politics*, 165–6. Payne, *History*, 485–6. Presner, *Muscular Judaism*, 13–37. D. Roberts, "Fascism," 91–3, 101–2. Turda, *Modernism*, 2–7, 120–3. Zox-Weaver, *Women*, 193.

71. Marshall Berman, *All That Is Solid*, 19–21, 88–9. Childs, *Modernism*, 39–42. Crook, *Modernist Radicalism*, 29. Thompson, *Fiction*, 115–18.

72. Griffin, *Modernism*, 161–73. Steinberg, *Proletarian Imagination*, 185–7.

73. Schmitt, *Political Romanticism*, 144–62.

74. Griffin, *Modernism*, 168–74. North, *Political Aesthetic*, 2–7, 167. For an implicit critique of this logic, see Armstrong, *Modernism*, 5. Moretti, *Modern Epic*, 228.

75. See Griffin, *Modernism*, 184. Günther, "Sotsializm i utopicheskoe myshlenie," in Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 43. Shorten, *Modernism*, 237–9. In Russian studies, this logic informs Boris Groys's *The Total Art of Stalinism* (1992), Igor' Golomshtok's *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo* (1994), and Irina Gutkin's *The Cultural Origins of the Socialist Realist Aesthetic* (1999).

76. Bauman, *Modernity*, 4–7.

77. Griffin, *Modernism*, 185. Jeffrey Herf, "Reactionary Modernism Reconsidered," in Sternhell, *Intellectual Revolt*, 133–4, 152–6. Thompson, *Fiction*, 111–18. Jennifer Wicke, "Coterie Consumption," in Dettmar and Watt, *Marketing*, 116–18.

78. Mints, "Ob evoliutsii russkogo simvolizma," *Poetika*, 178–9. Pustygina, "K izucheniiu evoliutsii," 143–4.

79. "Revoliutsiia dukha," 6–15.

80. Rudnev, "Novyi Grad," 506–7. See also Schmitt, *Political Romanticism*, 124–62.

81. Fondaminskii, "Zelenaia lampa," 44–5. See also Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia*, 295–7, 332–3, 354–6. Carlson, *"No Religion Higher Than Truth,"* 34–6. Katerina Clark, *Petersburg*, 2–18. Fitzpatrick, *Commissariat*, 121–2. Hoffmann, "European Modernity and Soviet Socialism," in Hoffmann and Kotsonis, *Russian Modernity*, 246–8. Steinberg, *Proletarian Imagination*, 19.

82. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (11 July 1926), 1. Belyi, "Prorok bezlichiia" (1908), *Arabeski*, 15. Berdiaev, *Krizis*, 34. Erenburg, "Novoe iskusstvo," 11–12; "Novaia proza," 2. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Gumanizm i sovremennost'" (1921), *Sochineniia*, 2: 206–7. Tasteven, *Futurizm*, 79. See also Gregory Freidin, "Revolution as an Esthetic Phenomenon," in Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Nietzsche*, 151.

83. Baudelaire, "Le Peintre de la vie moderne" (1863), *Oeuvres*, 2: 694. Ortega y Gasset, "The Dehumanization of Art," *Dehumanization*, 5–7. See also Berdiaev, *Krizis*, 4–20. Frank Raymond Leavis, *Mass Civilization*, 4–31.

84. Redman, *Ezra Pound*, 177–8, 196. Pound disputed the charge of anti-Semitism in letters to John Rodker (28 August 1946; n.d.) and Ludmila Savitzky (29 August 1946), Fonds Ludmila Savitzky, SVZ6, "Pound, Ezra et Dorothy," IMEC. See also Carlston, *Thinking*, 189–90.

85. Gary Saul Morson, "Gogol's Parables of Explanation," in Fusso and Meyer, *Essays*, 201–2.

86. Shklovskii, *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*, 195–6. See also Osip Mandel'shtam, "O prirode slova" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 173. Zamiatin, "O literature, revoliutsii i entropii" (1923), *Litsa*, 255–6.

87. Ivanov-Razumnik to Belyi (6 February 1924), in their *Perepiska*, 284.

88. Nusinov, "Maski," 3. See also Chudakova, "Skvoz' zvezdy k terniiam," *Literatura*, 344–5. Katerina Clark, *Petersburg*, 293–94. Dobrenko, "Socialist Realism," in Dobrenko and Balina, *Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*, 102–3. Gorham, *Speaking*, 103–8. Groys, *Total Art*, 38–40. Robin, *Réalisme socialiste*, 37. Tall, "Soviet Debate," 8–18.

89. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (9 January 1927), 1–2. See also Adamovich, "Zavist'" (1929); "Stikhi" (1932), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 155, 2: 110–11; "Sirin," 3. Fedotov, "Bor'ba," 33–7.

90. Chapoutot, *Loi du sang*. See also Laqueur, *Russia*, 53–125. Kellogg, *Russian Roots*, passim.

91. Andreas Huyssen, "Geographies of Modernism in a Globalizing World," in Thacker and Brooker, *Geographies*, 16. On the interaction of national modernist cultures, see Susan Friedman, "World Modernisms, World Literature, and Comparativity," in Wollaeger and Eatough, *Oxford Handbook*, 499–525; Friedman, "Periodizing Modernism," 427–9. For an attempt to locate Russian modernism in its transnational context, see Harsha Ram, "Futurist Geographies," in Wollaeger and Eatough, *Oxford Handbook*, 313–40.

92. Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities*, 6–7 and passim.

93. Fish, *Is There a Text*, 13–14. Fokkema, *Literary History*, 8–12.

94. Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic*, 39.

95. Louis Menand, "Kipling in the History of Forms," in DiBattista and McDiarmid, *High and Low Moderns*, 151.

96. Cooper, *Modernism*, 28.

97. For a detailed analysis of "Mire" and "Guy de Maupassant," see Livak, *Jewish Persona*, 233–58, 300–21.

98. Bernheimer, *Decadent Subjects*, 178. Kevin Brown, *Pox*, 179–80. Gay, *Freud*, 20–1, 101, 158. Jay Geller, "(G)nos(e)ology," in Eilberg-Schwartz, *People*, 256. Sander Gilman, "Salome, Sarah Bernhardt, and the Modern Jewess," in Nochlin and Garb, *Jew*, 103–5, 115.

99. Baudelaire, "Sur la Belgique," *Oeuvres*, 2: 961. Kevin Brown, *Pox*, 4. Carlston, *Thinking*, 34–6. Garb, *Bodies*, 55–6. Gilman, *Difference*, 38–9. Hayden, *Pox*, 63–7, 256. Nye, *Crime*, 135–7, 158–63. Mosse, *Nationalism*, 10. Quétel, *History*, 123. Schain, *Legend*, 82–3.

100. Frances Bernstein, "Visions of Sexual Health and Illness in Revolutionary Russia," in Davidson and Hall, *Sex*, 93–116. Bernstein, *Sonia's Daughters*, 51, 74, 161–4, 234. Bristow, *Prostitution*, 4, 22, 35, 46–7, 82. Corbin, *Filles*, 45, 362–8, 386–8. Christopher Forth, "Neurasthenia and Manhood in *fin-de-siècle* France," in Gijswijt-Hofstra and Porter, *Cultures*, 329–53; *Dreyfus Affair*, 8–13, 82–3, 205–33. Gilman, *Difference*, 158–9; Gilman, *Jew's Body*, 55–63, 76, 120–4. Quétel, *History*, 169–72, 192–4. Rimke and Hunt, "From Sinners," 73–6.

101. Kevin Brown, *Pox*, 78–84, 112. Corbin, *Filles*, 368–401. Dijkstra, *Idols*, 220–1, 386–401. Tamar Garb, "Modernity, Identity, Textuality," in Nochlin and Garb, *Jew*, 21–7. Gilman, *Jew's Body*, 2–19, 235.

102. Chekhov to Suvorin (27 December 1889), in Chekhov, *Polnoe sobranie* (*Pis'ma*) 3: 308–9.

103. Livak, *Jewish Persona*, 234–54.

104. Borenstein, *Men*, 3–5, 31–2. Suzanne Clark, *Sentimental Modernism*, 1–2. Halfin, "Rape of the Intelligentsia," 90–109.

105. Quétel, *History*, 172. For Russian examples, see Friche, "Osnovnye motivy zapadno-evropeiskogo modernizma," 227–30. Lelevich, "Vladimir Maiakovskii," 135–6. L'vov-Rogachevskii, *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 17, 20, 133.

106. On the interpretation of syphilis in Western modernist traditions, see Kevin Brown, *Pox*, 78–81. Hayden, *Pox*, xvi–xviii. Lasowski, *Syphilis*, 144–9, 162. Quétel, *History*, 127–30, 173. Schain, *Legend*, xi, 79–81. For syphilophobia in Russian modernist culture, see Kornei Chukovskii, "Bol'nichnye zapiski" (1968), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 404; letter to S. Sergeev-Tsenskii (12/25 February 1914), *Sobranie*, 14: 328. O. Eikhenbaum, "Iz vospominanii," in B. Eikhenbaum, *"Moi vremennik,"* 612–13. Jangfeldt, *Stavka*, 146–7. Khodasevich, "Pamiati B. A. Sadovskogo" (1925), *Nekropol'*, 325. Shklovskii, *Tret'ia fabrika* (1926), *Gamburgskii schet*, 104, 122, 144–5. In a letter to Richard Sylvester (10 September 1974), Berberova discusses the death of Khodasevich's brother from syphilis, observing, "At that time, such things happened in *every* family" (Nina Berberova Papers, Box 20, Folder 546, Beinecke).

107. On the place of syphilophobia in Blok's life and art, see Bernstein, *Sonia's Daughters*, 86–7. L. Blok, *I byl'*, 50, 80–1. A. Etkind, *Sodom*, 71. Matich, *Erotic Utopia*, 106–17. Presto, *Beyond the Flesh*, 29–30, 63, 91–5, 119–20, 259n35, 260n48. Pyman, *Life*, 1: 33, 57; 2: 147. For Blok's posthumous legend in modernist culture, see Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (4 July 1926), 2. Eikhenbaum, "Sud'ba Bloka" (1921), *O literature*, 356–57. Ginzburg, "Zapisi ne opublikovannye pri zhizni" (1927), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 386. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Pisatel'skie sud'by" (1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 326. Khodasevich, "Gumilev i Blok" (1931), *Nekropol'*, 92–4. For the Marxist interpretation, see Dmitrii Blagoi, "Blok Aleksandr Aleksandrovich," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, 1: 507.

108. E. Bershtein, "Tragediia pola," in Pavlova, *Erotizm*, 64–77. Carlston, *Thinking*, 3–5. Cavanagh, *Osip Mandelstam*, 193–4. Childs, *Modernism*, 23–4. Suzanne Clark, *Sentimental Modernism*, 1–2. Cohen, *Imagining*, 48–9. Delany, *Literature*, 150–1. Ekonen, *Tvorets*, 6–7, 16, 55. Freedman, *Temple*, 16–17. Gilbert and Gubar, introduction to *Female Imagination*, 1. J. Hoberman, "Otto Weininger and the Critique of Jewish Masculinity," in Harrowitz and Hyams, *Jews*, 141–53. B. Holmgren, "Stepping Out/Going Under," in Goscilo and Holmgren, *Russia*, 229–33. D. Maksimov, "'Severnyi vestnik' i simvolisty," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 91. T. Materer, "Make It Sell!," in Dettmar and Watt, *Marketing*, 20. Potter, *Modernism*, 184–6. Rabinowitz,

"No Room," 236–52. Charlotte Rosenthal, "Zinaida Vengerova," 97–106. Walker, *Maximilian Voloshin*, 67, 82. Zox-Weaver, *Women*, 66–7, 106–7.

109. Livak, *Jewish Persona*, 307–36. For modernist uses of the trope of syphilis, see Vaginov, *Kozlinaia pesn'* (1928), *Polnoe sobranie*, 29–30, 39–40. Z. Poliak, "O nenapisannom rasskaze Tynianova 'Pastushok Sifil,'" in Toddes, *Piatye tynianovskie chteniia*, 51–61.

110. Slonim, "I. Babel'," 113; *Portrety*, 143. See also Mirskii, "I. Babel'," 486–8.

111. Moretti, *Graphs, Maps, Trees*. Thacker, *Moving through Modernity*. Thacker and Brooker, *Geographies of Modernism*.

112. See Edson, *World Map*, 15–31, 163–5. Monmonier, *How to Lie*, 88. Tally, *Spatiality*, 1–25.

113. Aleksandr Blok, "O sovremennom sostoianii," 21–2.

114. Belyi, "Pesn' zhizni" (1908), *Arabeski*, 52.

115. Conrad, "Geography and Some Explorers," *Last Essays*, 3–19.

116. Monmonier, *How to Lie*, 2–27.

117. Reitblat, "'<. . .> chto blestit'?," 249–51. Von Hagen, "Toward a Cultural and Intellectual History," 289–97.

118. Turner, *Marketing*, 6–7. See also Quinones, *Mapping*, 22–3.

119. Josipovici, *What Ever Happened*, 178–82.

120. Khodasevich, "O simvolizme," 155.

121. Perry Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," 325.

122. Miliukov, "Intelligentsiia i istoricheskaia traditsiia," 94–5.

123. Mirskii, *Contemporary Russian Literature*, 42–3.

124. Mirskii, "Veianie smerti v predrevoliutsionnoi literature" (1927), *Uncollected Writings*, 233.

125. Belyi to Blok (April 1911), in their *Perepiska*, 408–9.

126. Livak, "Geroicheskie vremena molodoi zarubezhnoi poezii," Livak and Ustinov, *Literaturnyi avangard*, 80–7, 132–5.

127. Mints, "Ob evoliutsii russkogo simvolizma," *Poetika*, 175–87.

128. Briusov, "D. S. Merezhkovskii" (1907/1910), *Dalekie*, 57.

129. L. Gurevich to E. Mesching (23 March 1898; 24 April 1898), in Pavlova and Rabinowitz, "Russkie Modernen," 109–10, 112. Lavrov, "Z. N. Gippius i ee poeticheskii dnevnik," *Russkie simvolisty*, 46–50. D. Maksimov, "'Severnyi vestnik' i simvolisty"; "Novyi put'," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 99–100, 108–13, 117, 122–4, 146–7.

130. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 283.

131. Nikolai Bogomolov, "Serebrianyi vek," in Lanne, *Âge*, 134–7. Bronner, *Modernism*, 23–4. Serge Rolet, "L'Âge d'argent et ses repoussoirs," in Lanne, *Âge*, 45–52.

132. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 2: 82–3. Miliukov, *Ocherki*, 2: 331–5. See also Gorky to Andreev (8–12 August 1907), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 287–8. Clowes, *Revolution*, 40, 176–81. Michel Niqueux, "L'Utopie 'psychogénique' de Gorki," in Lanne, *Âge*, 398, 413.

133. B. Bialik, "Rozhdenie sotsialisticheskogo realizma v tvorchestve M. Gor'kogo," in Nikolaev, *Razvitie*, 259–62. Krutikova, *V nachale*, 4, 233, 303. L. Voitolovskii, "Itogi russkogo modernizma," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 189–91. See also Edward Brown, "Symbolist Contamination," 233–8. Günther, "Geroi v totalitarnoi kul'ture," 71–2. Tall, "Soviet Debate," 24–5.

134. Burenin, "Literaturnye chteniia i sobesedovaniia v obshchestve 'bedlam-modern,'" *Gore*, 73, 99–100. For the modernist critique of Gorky, see Belyi, "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," 43–4. Briusov, "Athenaeum," 49. Chulkov, "Chetvertyi sbornik," 290–3. Ellis, "Nashi epigony," 65. Filosofov, "O 'lzhi,'" 215–16. Otsup, "Klim Samgin," 181–3. Pant-ov, "Sbornik," 52–3. I. Smirnov, "Sborniki," 48.

135. Vengerov, "Pobediteli ili pobezhdennye?," *Osnovnye cherty*, 58; "Etapy neoromanticheskogo dvizheniia," *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 16–18.

136. Andreev to Gorky (13 August 1907), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 289–92. Ellis, "Nashi epigony," 61–8. Gurevich, "Literatura nashego vremeni," 102–3. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Velikii Pan," *Tvorchestvo*, 2: 45–6. L'vov-Rogachevskii, *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 65, 182. Prishvin, "Okhota za schast'em" (1926); "Zhuravlinaia rodina" (1929), *Sobranie*, 3: 15–18, 51, 84–6. Remizov, "Peterburgskii buerak," *Izbrannoe*, 554–6. Vengerov, "Etapy neo-romanticheskogo dvizheniia," 18. Veresaev, "Vospominaniia o Leonide Andreeve," 151. Zaitsev, "Beseda s Borisom Zaitsevym," in Guerra, *"Kogda my v Rossiiu vernemsia,"* 69–73. See also Brandist, *Carnival Culture*, 135–6. Markov, "Neizvestnyi pisatel' Remizov," *O svobode*, 235–6. Seifrid, *Andrei Platonov*, 12–19, 30–1, 287–9. Tolstaia, *Kliuchi schast'ia* (chapters 1–3).

137. Levenson, *Modernism*, 214. Shaw, "The Sanity of Art" (1895), *Major Critical Essays*, 320–1.

138. For the recent shift to the study of Russian modernism's readers and noncanonical writers, see Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*. Obatnin, "K izucheniiu malykh poetov modernizma," 100–33. Sobolev, *Leteiskaia biblioteka*. Timenchik, *Chto vdrug*.

139. Rolet, "Âge d'argent et ses repoussoirs," 45–57.

140. Adamovich, "O Bunine," 2; "Literaturnye besedy" (31 January 1926), 1–2; "Litsa i knigi," 324–9. Briusov, "Poety-realisty.—II. Ivan Bunin" (1907), *Dalekie*, 154–5. Chukovskaia (30 December 1941), *Zapiski*, 1: 363–4. Iashchenko, "O novykh putiakh," 2. Anton Krainii [Gippius], "Literaturnye razmyshleniia," 148. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Simvolisty," 305–7. Slonim, "Desiat' let russkoi literatury," 92. See also Dolgopolov, *Na rubezhe vekov*, 278–9, 289–92.

141. Bogomolov, Kobrinskii, and Lekmanov, *Ot simvolistov*, 1: 602. Bogomolov, "Serebrianyi vek," 136–7.

142. Briusov (14 December 1898), *Dnevniki. Avtobiograficheskaia proza*, 73–4; "Iv. A. Bunin," 193–4. Chulkov, "Listopad," *Pokryvalo*, 130–40. Sergei Postnikov, "Andrei Belyi, pisatel' i chelovek," in Boichuk, *Andrei Belyi*, 149. S. Solov'ev, "Ivan Bunin," 89.

143. Aseev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 70. Batiushkov, "Iv. A. Bunin," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 342–51. Bitsilli, "Formula," 399. Ivanov-Razumnik, "*Russkaia literatura XX veka*," 60. Mochul'skii, "Poslednee svidanie," 2–3. Stepun, "I. A. Bunin," 324–7; "Porevoliutsionnoe soznanie," 16–17. Tal'nikov, "Simvolizm," 124–33. Tsetlin, "Ivan Bunin," 450. Veidle, "I. Bunin," 195–6.

144. Apostolov, *Impressionizm*, 69. Bunin, "Avtobiograficheskaia zametka," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 339–40; letter to V. Rudnev (25.X.1933), in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 2: 871. Kornei Chukovskii, "Bol'nichnye zapiski" (1968), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 414–16. Levidov, "I. A. Bunin," 42.

145. Josipovici, *What Ever Happened*, 179.

146. See Terras, *Handbook of Russian Literature*. Wachtel and Vinitsky, *Russian Literature*.

Chapter 1. The Toponymical Labyrinth of Russian Modernist Culture

1. Tynianov, "Literaturnyi fakt" (1924), *Arkhaisty*, 29.

2. Keys, *Reluctant Modernist*, 6.

3. Markov, "Mysli," 175.

4. Markov, *Russian Futurism*, 384.

5. Markov, "K voprosu o granitsakh dekadansa v russkoi poezii"; "Poeziia Mikhaila Kuzmina," *O svobode*, 54, 121–3, 143–5.

6. Gasparov, "Poetika 'serebrianogo veka,'" in Gasparov and Koretskaia, *Russkaia poeziia*, 7. Aleksandr Parnis, "Pervaia kniga po istorii russkogo futurizma," in Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 228.

7. Pound, "Harold Monro," 590. Wilson is cited in Sherry, "Modernism," 145. See also Perry Anderson, "Postscript to 'Marshall Berman: Modernity and Revolution,'" *Zone*, 53. Armstrong, *Modernism*, 24. Childs, *Modernism*, 14–15. Scholes and Wulfman, *Modernism*, 79. Stan Smith, *Origins*, 1–11. On the transferability of Anglo-American terminology, see Keys, *Reluctant Modernist*, 12.

8. Jean-Michel Rabaté, "Modernism and the French Novel," in Castle, *History*, 87.

9. Lalou, *Histoire*, 166–7, 246, 294–5. Maurice Samuels, "France," in Lewis, *Cambridge Companion*, 13. Thibaudet, *Histoire*, 520. Cf. André Fontainas's use of Symbolism as a period term, in *Mes souvenirs*, 17. See also Chefdor, "Modernism," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 2. Kimberley Healey, "French Literary Modernism," in Eysteinsson and Liska, *Modernism*, 2: 801.

10. Mints, "Novye romantiki," 156. Williams, *Politics*, 50.

11. Mints, "Ob evoliutsii russkogo simvolizma," *Poetika*, 175.

12. Sturgis, *Passionate Attitudes*, 22–6.

13. Introduction to Constable, Denisoff, and Potolsky, *Perennial Decay*, 12.

14. Lormel, "Les Débuts," 6: 603–8; 8: 755–9; 10: 983–6. Sturgis, *Passionate Attitudes*, 41–2.

15. Aurier, "Boniment," 2. See also Compagnon, *Cinq paradoxes*, 18. Michel Décaudin, "Being Modern in 1885," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 31.

16. "Modernisme," 4–6.

17. Visan, "Idéal," 194–8.

18. Marchal, *Lire*, 5–6. René Wellek, "What Is Symbolism?," in Balakian, *Symbolist Movement*, 18–22.

19. Marchal, *Lire*, xi.

20. Nikolai Bogomolov, "K semantike slova 'dekadent' u molodogo Briusova," in Toddes, *Piatye tynianovskie chteniia*, 100–1. Chamberlin, "Images of Degeneration," in Chamberlin and Gilman *Degeneration*, 267. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 173. Michel Décaudin, "The Fate of Symbolism," in Balakian, *Symbolist Movement*, 119–21.

21. Mints, "Novye romantiki," 149–55.

22. Briusov, "Vstupitel'naia zametka," *Russkie simvolisty*, 2: 10; "Otvet," *Sredi stikhov*, 43.

23. M. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm i dekadentstvo" (1907), *Kniga*, 4–6, 12, 18, 28.

24. Apostolov, *Impressionizm*, 11, 14–15, 21. Vengerov, "Etapy neo-romanticheskogo dvizheniia," *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 16–18. See also Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.2: 8, 113, 143. L. Kozlovskii, "Leonid Andreev," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 253.

25. Zhirmunskii, *Nemetskii romantizm*, 190–6. See also Lavrov, *Russkie simvolisty*, 554–8.

26. Adamovich, "O Bunine," 2. Pasternak, *Okhrannaia gramota* (1931), *Vozdushnye puti*, 272–3.

27. V. Cheshikhin-Vetrinskii, "Neoromantizm," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 1: 514–15. Shamurin, "Osnovnye techeniia v dorevoliutsionnoi russkoi poezii XX veka," in Ezhov and Shamurin, *Russkaia poeziia*, xix. See also V. Khalizev, "Russkaia literatura nachala XX veka v trudakh V. M. Zhirmunskogo 1914–1921 gg.," in Esaulov, *Postsimvolizm*, 2: 50–2. For a critique of this usage, see Saianov, "Romantizm, realizm, naturalizm," *Ot klassikov*, 37–8, 41, 74.

28. Miller-Budnitskaia, "Ob 'Ulisse,'" 177. Pavel Miliukov in "Politika i iskusstvo. Vecher 'Chisel,'" 260.

29. B. Mikhailovskii, "Simvolizm," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, 10: 713.

30. B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 13, 19.

31. Bëm, "O s''ezde sovetskikh pisatelei" (1934), *Issledovaniia*, 408. Bialik, "Vvedenie," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 38–9.

32. Merezhkovskii, *Izbrannye stat'i*, 250, 289.

33. Stasov, "Prosvetitel' po chasti khudozhestva" (1897); "Nishchie dukhom" (1899); "Dve dekadentskie vystavki" (1903); "Nashi nyneshnie dekadenty" (1906); "Iskusstvo XIX veka" (1901–6), *Izbrannye sochineniia*, 3: 205–14, 232–8, 287–95, 315, 505.

34. Anichkov, *Realizm*, 4–9. Belyi, "Poet mramora i bronzy" (1907), *Arabeski*, 449–50. Berdiaev, "Kul'tura," 326; "Dekadentstvo," 121. Briusov, "Predislovie ['Tertsia Vigiliia']" and "Interv'iu" (1900); "Ko vsem, kto ishchet" (1901), *Sredi stikhov*, 49, 58–61. Ellis, "Krizis," 63–4. Vengerova, "Poety simvolisty vo Frantsii" (1892); "Meterlink kak khudozhnik i myslitel'" (1905), *Literaturnye kharakteristiki*, 1: 205, 2: 3.

35. Briusov (26 December 1895), "Pis'ma iz rabochikh tetradei," 692.

36. Avrelii [Briusov], "Fakely," 54–5. V. Bakulin [Briusov], "Torzhestvo," 54. Aleksandr Blok, "Voprosy," 68. Briusov, "Bal'mont," 30; "Strast'," 21; "Fëdor Sologub," 50; "Sviashchennaia zhertva," 26; "N. Gumilev," 68. Chulkov, *O misticheskom anarkhizme*, 24. Ellis, "O sovremennom simvolizme," 75–7; "Materialy dlia literaturnogo manifesta" (1907), in A. Lavrov, "Ellis v 'Vesakh'" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 293–4). "K chitateliam," iii. Muratov, "O vysokom khudozhestve," 75, 83. "Ot redaktsii," *Vesy* 12 (1909), 186. Iu. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 1: 11. Toporkov, "O novom realizme," 47.

37. Vengerov, "Pobediteli ili pobezhdennye? (O modernizme)," *Osnovnye cherty*, 42.

38. Aleksandr Blok, "'Bez bozhestva, bez vdokhnoven'ia.' (Tsekh akmeistov)" (1921), in Ivanov-Razumnik, *Sovremennaia literatura*, 5. Zaitsev, "Serebrianyi vek" (1959), *Sobranie*, 2: 471.

39. Belyi to Blok (6 June 1911), in their *Perepiska*, 406.

40. Bradbury and McFarlane, "The Name and Nature of Modernism," *Modernism*, 37–9.

41. Gurevich, "Priblizhen'e krizisa," *Literatura*, 84–5.

42. Briusov, "Zven'ia. 2. Zolotoe runo," *Sredi stikhov*, 176.

43. Belyi, "Pevitsa," 302–3. Briusov, "Bal'mont," 29–30. Filosofov, "Berlinskie vystavki," 148. Grabar', "Miunkhenskie vystavki," 15–16: 62; 17–18: 100. Volynskii, "Dekadentstvo i simvolizm" (1896), *Bor'ba*, 314.

44. Stasov, "Dve dekadentskie vystavki," 287–8, 294.

45. Berdiaev, "Dekadentstvo," 121. Briusov, "Sviashchennaia zhertva," 25–6. M. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm i dekadentstvo," i, 28. See also Bachinskii, "*Fakely*," 82.

46. Belyi, "Pevitsa," 302–3; "Ognennyi angel," *Arabeski*, 454.

47. Zhirmunskii, *Nemetskii romantizm*, 190, 196. Vermel', "Poeziia," 33.

48. Ashukin, "Sovremennost'," 4–6. D. Burliuk et al., "Poshchechina obshchestvennomu vkusu" (1912); A. Kruchenykh, "Novye puti slova" (1913), in Markov, *Manifesty*, 50, 68. Erenburg, "Novoe iskusstvo," 11–12. Gorodetskii, "Nekotorye techeniia," 49. Iashchenko, "Literatura," 3. Vasilii Kamenskii, "Iz istorii russkogo futurizma" (1914), in Malmstad, "From the History of the Russian Avant-Garde" (Vroon and Malmstad, *Readings*, 218). Maiakovskii and Brik, "Nasha slovesnaia rabota," 41. Oksenov, "Pis'ma," 30. "Ot redaktsii," *Versty*, 1 (1926), 6. Tasteven, *Futurizm*, 9, 20–1, 75.

49. Zamiatin, "Novaia russkaia proza" (1923); "O segodniashnem i sovremennom" (1924), *Litsa*, 208, 229. I have found only a few instances of usage echoing Zamiatin's:

Turintsev, "Opyt," 215–17, 226–7. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Preodolenie," 190. For negative usage, see Iashchenko, "Literatura," 3. Shletser, "O modernistakh," 2–3. For Marxist usage, see Lezhnev, "'Levoe' iskusstvo i ego sotsial'nyi smysl" (1929), *O literature*, 89–90. Tal'nikov, "Literaturnye zametki," 193–4, 198.

50. Gofshtetter, *Poeziia*, 3–4. Skabichevskii, "Novye techeniia," 92. Stasov, "Prosvetitel' po chasti khudozhestva" (1897); "Vystavki" (1898); "Nishchie dukhom" (1899); "Podvor'e prokazhennykh" (1899); "Dve dekadentskie vystavki" (1903); "Nashi nyneshnie dekadenty" (1906); "Iskusstvo XIX veka" (1901–6), *Izbrannye sochineniia*, 3: 214–28, 232–8, 257–63, 287–95, 315–21, 505–6, 556–8, 581–93, 599–610, 659, 673.

51. Vengerova, "Poety simvolisty vo Frantsii," 205–9.

52. Briusov (17 October/11 November 1895), "Pis'ma iz rabochikh tetradei," 684–91. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 173–4.

53. Glinskii, "Bolezn'," 618–55. Vladimir Solov'ev, "Russkie simvolisty" (1894–95), *Stikhotvoreniia*, 270–80. See also T. Erokhina, "Simvolizm v 1913 godu," in Osipova, *Russkaia kul'tura*, 83–4.

54. Aleksandr Blok, "Iunosheskii dnevnik," 313. See also B. Mikhailovskii, "Simvolizm," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 305.

55. Chulkov, "Pokryvalo Izidy," *Pokryvalo*, 13, 19–20; "Opravdanie simvolizma," *Nashi sputniki*, 123. M. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm i dekadentstvo," 19–26. Sergei Solov'ev, "Simvolizm," 53–4. Vengerova, "Meterlink kak khudozhnik i myslitel'," 2–4. See also Ivanov-Razumnik, "*Russkaia literatura XX veka*," 60; *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 22–35. Makovskii, *Na Parnase*, 18–19.

56. Belyi (28 October 1905), in Briusov, "Perepiska s Andreem Belym," 386–8. Briusov, "Ot izdatelia," *Russkie simvolisty*, 1: 3. Konevskoi to I. Bilibin (28 June 1897), "Iz arkhiva Ivana Konevskogo," ed. Lavrov (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 155). Voloshin (29 August 1901), *Maksimilian Voloshin*, 3: 303–4. Volynskii, "Dekadentstvo i simvolizm" (1896); "O simvolizme i simvolistakh" (1899); "Predislovie" (1900), *Bor'ba*, ii–iii, 314–20, 482–7. See also Nikolai Bogomolov, "Zhizn' sredi stikhov," in Briusov, *Sredi stikhov*, 6. Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 111–17.

57. Denis Denisoff, "Decadence and Aestheticism," in Marshall, *Fin de Siècle*, 31.

58. Sturgis, *Passionate Attitudes*, 277–8. Symons, *Symbolist Movement*, 2–4.

59. Sherry, "Modernism," 148–52.

60. Filosofov, "Berlinskie vystavki," 152; "Natsionalizm," 209–11. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Dekadentstvo v sovremennom russkom iskusstve" (1901), in Aleksandr Blok, "Perepiska s R. V. Ivanovym-Razumnikom," 367, 386.

61. Belyi, "Neskol'ko slov," 67. Berdiaev, "Kul'tura," 326–7. Chulkov, *Gody*, 61. "K chitateliam," iii. Merezhkovskii, "L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii," *L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii*, 350. See also Belyi, "Kritikizm," 12–13. Benois, "Volshebnoe zerkal'tse," 4–5. Briusov, "Fëdor Sologub," 50; "Sviashchennaia zhertva," 25–6; "Nashi dekadenty" (1902),

"Al'manakh Grif" (1904), "Odnomu razviaznomu kritiku," *Sredi stikhov*, 68–70, 104, 160–2. Kornei Chukovskii, "Pis'ma o sovremennosti. Pis'mo pervoe" (1902), *Sobranie*, 6: 235–7. "V zhurnalakh i gazetakh," 82. A. Remizov to O. Madelung (2 March 1904) and F. Fidler (9 January 1906), in Lavrov, *Russkie simvolisty*, 116. Rozanov, *Dekadenty*, 3, 8. "V zhurnalakh.—Russkii vestnik," 71.

62. Anton Krainii [Z. Gippius], "O 'Shipovnike,'" 56.

63. Briusov, "Zven'ia" (1906), *Sredi stikhov*, 172; letter to Ia. Briusov (21–24 July 1907), in Lavrov, *Russkie simvolisty*, 480; letter to G. Chulkov (19 January 1907), in Chulkov, *Gody*, 347.

64. Belyi, "Poet mramora i bronzy," 448–50. Kornei Chukovskii, "Peterburgskie teatry," 75–6; "Novaia povest' L. Andreeva" (1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 438–9. Chulkov, "Dymnyi ladan," *Pokryvalo*, 55–7. On the persistence of the term Decadent as a generic self-appellation synonymous with Symbolism, see Belyi's letter to M. Morozova (28 August–10 September 1912), in Lavrov, *Russkie simvolisty*, 125. V. Gofman (6 January 1910), in "Pis'ma V. V. Gofmana k A. A. Shemshurinu," ed. Lavrov (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 274).

65. Bal'mont, "Nashe literaturnoe segodnia," 61. Aleksandr Blok, "Voprosy," 69; letter to G. Chulkov (1 July 1906), in Chulkov, *Gody*, 371. Kornei Chukovskii (6 June 1906), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 28; letters to V. Briusov (20 October 1906; 2 June 1907) and E. Liatskoi (December 1906), *Sobranie*, 14: 101, 109, 136.

66. Avrelii [Briusov], "Fakely," 54–5. Viacheslav Ivanov, "O 'fakel'shchikakh,'" 52–5; letter to Briusov (3 June 1906), in Briusov, "Perepiska s Viacheslavom Ivanovym," 492. Merezhkovskii, "Dekadentstvo," 30. See also Chulkov, *O misticheskom anarkhizme*, 45, 55; "Liliia i roza," "Razoblachennaia magiia," *Pokryvalo*, 37–8, 116.

67. See Briusov, "Karl V.—Dialog o realizme v iskusstve" (1906), *Sredi stikhov*, 184–6.

68. Berdiaev, "Dekadentstvo," 121. Ellis, "V zashchitu dekadentstva," in Ermichev, *N. A. Berdiaev*, 1: 167. Obatnin, "Neopublikovannye materialy," 473. On the post-1905 trajectory of *Vesy*, see Azadovskii and Maksimov, "Briusov," 284–316. Lavrov, "Briusov i Ellis," *Russkie simvolisty*, 129.

69. Arkadii Gornfel'd, "Zametki o sovremennoi literature," in *Kuda my idem?*, 48–55.

70. Belyi, "Teoriia," 40; "Poet mramora i bronzy," 448–50. Aleksandr Blok, "Voprosy," 68. Chulkov, "Razoblachennaia magiia"; "Iskhod," *Pokryvalo*, 73–4, 77, 115–19. Ellis, "Krizis," 63–5; "Itogi," 55. Sergei Solov'ev, "Simvolizm," 53–4. See also V. Bakulin [Briusov], "Torzhestvo," 53–7. M. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm i dekadentstvo," 19–26. The letters of Belyi and Blok (6–10 August 1907), in Orlov, "Iz literaturnogo nasledstva," 383–4, 391.

71. Séménoff, "Mysticisme," 361–2.

72. Aleksandr Blok (26 August 1907), in Chulkov, *Gody*, 376–7. Briusov, "Une lettre," 188. Orlov, "Iz literaturnogo nasledstva," 371–403.

73. Filosofov, "Dela," 3.

74. Belyi, "Aleksandr Blok," 59; "O simvolizme," 1: 10; 2: 6–7, 9–10. Ellis to V. Briusov (29 April 1909), in Lavrov, "Ellis v 'Vesakh'" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 320). Viacheslav Ivanov, "Zavety," 13; "Mysli," 7–9. See also Aleksandr Blok, "Bez bozhestva, bez vdokhnoven'ia," 8. Ghil, "Pis'ma," 26; "Sovremennye napravleniia," 15–23. "Gibel' literaturnykh shkol," 79.

75. Avrelii [Briusov], "Fakely," 54–6. Bal'mont, "Nashe literaturnoe segodnia," 61. Aleksandr Blok, "O sovremennoi kritike" (1907), *Sobranie*, 5: 207; "Voprosy," 68–9. Z. Gippius, "Iz dnevnika zhurnalista. Dekadenty i soznanie," in Ermichev, *N. A. Berdiaev*, 182. Viacheslav Ivanov, "O 'fakel'shchikakh,'" 52–4. See also Kornei Chukovskii, "Sergeev-Tsenskii," *Ot Chekhova*, 54–5, 58–60.

76. Belyi, "Literaturno-khudozhestvennye al'manakhi," 94. V. Bakulin [Briusov], "Proekt," 46. See also Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 199, 203–6. Kornei Chukovskii, "Russkaia literatura <v 1907 godu>" (1908), *Sobranie*, 6: 551. L'vov-Rogachevskii, *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 182. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," 53.

77. Gornfel'd, "Torzhestvo pobeditelei" (1908), *Knigi*, 129–30. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Byt' ili ne byt'," 81–3. Pil'skii, *Problema*, 21–2, 35.

78. Poves and Kogan, *Modernisty*, 5–8. See Briusov's favorable 1908 review of this catalogue, in *Sredi stikhov*, 266.

79. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 80, 154; 2: 82. V. Friche, "Osnovnye motivy zapadno-evropeiskogo modernizma," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 2: 227–8. Iu. Kamenev, "O laskovom starike i o Valerii Briusove"; Iu. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada"; L. Voitolovskii, "Itogi russkogo modernizma," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 1: 5–21, 58, 178–88. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Byt' ili ne byt'," 85. Vorovskii, "O burzhuaznosti modernistov" (1908), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 197–9.

80. Anichkov, *Realizm*, 83. See also Gornfel'd, "Zametki o sovremennoi literature," 48–55.

81. Gurevich, "Literatura nashego vremeni," 99.

82. Ellis, "O sovremennom simvolizme," 75; "O vandalizme," 86; "Ob al'manakhakh," 75; *Russkie simvolisty*, 228–9. Gurevich, "Literatura nashego vremeni," 99. "Pchely i osy Apollona. Skuchnyi razgovor," 83–4.

83. "Ot redaktsii," *Vesy* 12 (1909), 186, 191. See also Chebotarevskaia, "Po povodu," 10; "Iz dnevnika," 27. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nekrasov i modernisty" (1915), *Litsa*, 214–16; letters to N. Rubakin (January 1912) and I. Repin (February 1912), *Sobranie*, 14: 273, 278. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Tvorchestvo A. Remizova" (1910–11), *Tvorchestvo*, 1: 80–2. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Simvolisty," 6: 264; 7: 305–6. Sologub, "Zametki," *Dnevniki pisatelei* 1 (1914), 15.

84. Cited in T. Erokhina, "Simvolizm v 1913 godu," in Osipova, *Russkaia kul'tura*, 85.

85. Z. Vengerova, "Avtobiograficheskaia spravka" (1914), in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 136–7.

86. Vengerova, "Simvolizm," 9.

87. A. Kondrat'ev to V. Briusov (12 May 1911), in Bogomolov, "Zametki o russkom modernizme," *Russkaia literatura*, 436.

88. Briusov, "Segodniashnii den' russkoi poezii" (1912); "Ivan Konevskoi" (1916), *Sredi stikhov*, 370, 481–2.

89. Grabar', "Pis'ma," 75. N-k [Nurok], "Vystavki," 15–16. Rostislavov, "O shkolakh," 19.

90. Belyi, "Chekhov," 3–5. See similar usage in Meierkhol'd, "Iz pisem," 97–8.

91. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (16 May 1926), 3. Briusov to Z. Gippius (22 May 1907), "Pis'ma k peterburgskim i moskovskim literatoram," 696. Kornei Chukovskii, "Meshchanin protiv meshchanstva" (1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 454–5. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 34, 73, 129, 135. Khodasevich to S. Kissin (19 June–1 July 1911), *Sobranie*, 4: 384. Krandievskaia and Mirtov, "Dva pis'ma," 298–9. See also Nabokov, *Otchaianie* (1932), *Sobranie*, 3: 430.

92. Burenin, "Literaturnye chteniia i sobesedovaniia v obshchestve 'bedlam-modern,'" *Gore*, 57–8, 72–3, 99.

93. Belyi, "M. Kuzmin," 50; "Shtempelevannaia kalosha," 48–51; "Slovo," 59–60; "Ognennyi angel," *Arabeski*, 454–6. Belyi to Ellis (7–11 August 1907), in Lavrov, *Andrei Belyi*, 414. Ellis, "Nashi epigony," 62; "Frantsuzskie liriki XIX veka," 90. Sergei Solov'ev, "M. Kuzmin," 95. Metner, *Modernizm*, 5–7, 35–8. See also Empirik (Tasteven), "Prichiny," 80. "Vesti otovsiudu," 80.

94. Kuzmin (7 July 1910), *Dnevnik 1908–1915*, 222. Sergei Makovskii, in *Kuda my idem?*, 101.

95. Briusov, "D. S. Merezhkovskii," *Dalekie*, 57. See Ivanov's draft response to *Vesy*, in Obatnin, "Neopublikovannye materialy," 475. Ivanov to Briusov (4 August 1907), in Briusov, "Perepiska s Viacheslavom Ivanovym," 502, 504.

96. Apostolov, *Impressionizm*, 4–6. Briusov, "Iz zhurnalov" (1908); "Modernisty, ikh predshestvenniki i kriticheskaia literatura o nikh" (1908), *Sredi stikhov*, 259–60, 266. Kornei Chukovskii, "Meshchanin protiv meshchanstva" (1907); "Russkaia literatura <v 1907 godu>" (1908), *Sobranie*, 6: 454–5, 551, 554–5. Chulkov, "Pokryvalo"; "Listopad," *Pokryvalo*, 29, 137. Sergei Gorodetskii, "Pervoputok" (1908), in Gennadii Obatnin, "'Vos'midesiatniki' i 'poteriannoe pokolenie 1914 goda,'" (Bagno, Malmstad, and Malikova, *Na rubezhe*, 478). Ianovskii [Belyi], "Literaturnyi raspad," 70–2. Korolenko, "'Severnye sborniki.' Izdatel'stvo 'Shipovnik.' Kn. V. 1908," *Sobranie*, 8: 334. Prishvin (21 October, 2 November 1908), *Rannii dnevnik*, 178, 181. Radakov, "Kak ia stal geniem," 9. Toporkov, "O novom realizme," 46–7. See also P. Boborykin, "Rasput'e kritiki"; A. Gornfel'd, "Zametki o sovremennoi literature," in *Kuda my idem?*, 53–4, 170–1. "Pchely i osy Apollona. Nashi kritiki v tsitatakh," 62. Tal'nikov, "Simvolizm," 124–5, 129, 132–3. Vasilevskii [Ne-Bukva], "Modernisty," 7–8.

97. Belyi, "Poet mramora i bronzy," 448–50. See also Belyi, "Vol'nootpushchenniki," 71–2. Ellis, "Esche odna korona," 63.

98. Belyi, "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," 38–9.

99. Anichkov, *Realizm*, 4, 9. Gumilev, "Poeziia," 42–4.

100. "Ot redaktsii," *Trudy i dni* 1 (1912), 1.

101. Briusov, "O 'rechi rabskoi,'" 32–3. Kuzmin, "Pis'mo," 57. Aleksandr Blok (17 April 1912), *Dnevnik*, 1: 96. See also Eikhenbaum, "Anna Akhmatova" (1923), *O poezii*, 78–9. Lavrov, "Trudy i dni," *Russkie simvolisty*, 511, 514.

102. Belyi to Blok (10 January 1913), in their *Perepiska*, 486.

103. Adrianov, "Kriticheskie nabroski," 386. Arabazhin, *Etiudy*, 174. Chernov, "Modernizm v russkoi poezii" (November 1910), 209, 215–16, 224. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 11–12, 15, 38, 242–3. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.2: 31–2, 75, 79–80, 113, 152; 3.3: 117–18. Red'ko, "U podnozhiia," 6: 319–20. Tal'nikov, "Simvolizm," 124–5, 128–9, 132–3, 146.

104. Vengerov, "Pobediteli ili pobezhdennye?" 42–3, 74.

105. Vengerov, "Etapy neo-romanticheskogo dvizheniia," 16–18. See also A. Gornfel'd, "Fëdor Sologub"; L. Kozlovskii, "Leonid Andreev"; P. Mitrofanov, "Innokentii Annenskii," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 14, 253, 279, 296.

106. S. Makovskii to E. Znosko-Borovskii (3 February 1910), in N. Bogomolov, "Pis'ma Ellisa k Viacheslavu Ivanovu" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 374).

107. Vladimir Guitine, "Innokenti Annenski," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 1: 180. Makovskii, *Na Parnase*, 140.

108. See Vladimir Piast's essays and lectures (1911–13) bringing to the common denominator Akhmatova, Belyi, Kamenskii, Mandel'shtam, Narbut, and Severianin: Obatnin, "Vos'midesiatniki' i 'poteriannoe pokolenie 1914 goda," 478–79.

109. Annenskii, "O sovremennom lirizme," 1: 19–20, 22; 2: 29; 3: 5, 8.

110. Chudovskii, "Russkaia mysl'," 73.

111. Gumilev, "Poeziia," 42–4; "Pis'ma," 8: 59–62.

112. Gumilev, "Nekrologi," 77–8; "Pis'ma," 6: 53. See also Chudovskii, "Po povodu," 48.

113. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 73. See also Lekmanov, *Kniga*, 38–9.

114. See Briusov in Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 611, 629. Lekmanov, "Akmeizm. Materialy k bibliografii," *Kniga*, 156. Akhmatova's claim that the term and notion of Acmeism emerged in late 1911 remains uncorroborated (*Zapisnye knizhki*, 82, 131, 452, 612, 629).

115. Briusov, "Novye techeniia v russkoi poezii.—Akmeisty" (1913), *Sredi stikhov*, 393–400; letter to A. Chebotarevskaia (9 February 1913), "Pis'ma k peterburgskim i moskovskim literatoram," 702. Khovin, "Modernizirovannyi Adam," 14. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Vchera," 125; "Simvolisty," 7: 305. See also Oleg Lekmanov, "Akmeizm vs. futurism v 1913 godu," in Jaccard and Morard, *1913*, 194–7.

116. Akhmatova in Aleksandr Mets, "Epizod iz istorii akmeizma" (Toddes, *Piatye*

tynianovskie chteniia, 117–18); *Zapisnye knizhki*, 82, 376–7. L. Mandrykina, "Nenapisannaia kniga," in Voronova, *Knigi*, 67.

117. See Georgii Adamovich's interview with Iurii Ivask, in Bogomolov, "Proekt 'Akmeizm,'" 144, 148. Aleksandr Blok, "Bez bozhestva, bez vdokhnoven'ia," 7–11. Konstantin Erberg, "Vospominaniia" (1939–41), in Lavrov and Grechishkin, *Simvolisty vblizi*, 214–15. Mochul'skii, "Klassitsizm," 368.

118. Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 251. Narbut to Zenkevich (7 April 1913), in Lekmanov, *Kniga*, 12–13. Lekmanov, "Mandel'shtam i Maiakovskii," *Kniga*, 569.

119. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 202. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Utro akmeizma" (1912/1919); "O prirode slova" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 142, 176–87. See also Boris Gasparov, "Izviniaius'," in Vroon and Malmstad, *Readings*, 116. Viacheslav Vs. Ivanov, "O vozdeistvii 'esteticheskogo eksperimenta' Andreia Belogo," in Lesnevskii and Mikhailov, *Andrei Belyi*, 365. Lekmanov, *Zhizn'*, 52–4, 100, 106; *Kniga*, 15. Markov, "Mysli," 174, 178–9; *Russian Futurism*, 40, 139–40. Mets, "Epizod iz istorii akmeizma," 117–18. A. Miasnikov, "U istokov 'formal'noi shkoly,'" in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 324. Oraic, "Tsitatnost'," 118, 129–30. Timenchik, "Zametki," 5.3: 281–300. Toddes, "Mandel'shtam," 98.

120. Vl. V. Gippius, "Nichtozhnye slova o nizhtozhnykh delakh," ed. A. Mets, in Bagno, Malmstad, and Malikova, *Na rubezhe*, 427–8, 432. Red'ko, "U podnozhiia" 7: 180.

121. Gorodetskii, "Nekotorye techeniia," 46–50. Gumilev, "Zhizn'," 13–14; "Pis'ma," 9: 53. "Smes'," 70–1. See also Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 82, 452, 611. Belyi, "Vospominaniia," 3: 256. Briusov, "N. Gumilev," 68; "Vchera," 40, 51; "N. Gumilev. *Zhemchuga*" (1910), *Dalekie*, 145–6. Chukovskaia (9 April 1964), *Zapiski*, 3: 204. Chulkov, "Iskhod," *Pokryvalo*, 77–80. Vl. V. Gippius, "Nichtozhnye slova o nizhtozhnykh delakh," 430–32. Gumilev (28 March 1913), in Briusov, "Perepiska s N. S. Gumilevym," 512–13. Khodasevich, "Krizis," 3. Khovin, "Modernizirovannyi Adam," 9–13. On the rapport between early modernist and Acmeist programs, see Mickiewicz, "Problem," 7–9. Peterson, *History*, 11, 157–8. Stone, "Aleksandr Blok," 640. Timenchik, "Zametki," passim.

122. Aleksandr Blok, "Bez bozhestva, bez vdokhnoven'ia," 12–14. Briusov, "Novye techeniia v russkoi poezii.—Akmeisty," 399–400. Makovskii, *Na Parnase*, 217. Sadovskoi, "Konets," 230–1. Iurii Verkhovskii, "Put' poeta. O poezii N. S. Gumileva," in Ivanov-Razumnik, *Sovremennaia literatura*, 142–3.

123. "Smes'," 71. V. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Akmeisty ili Adamisty," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 1: 28–31.

124. Aleksandr Blok (28 May, 11 October, 17 December 1912; 20 April 1913), *Dnevnik*, 1: 103, 121–2, 151, 200. See also Vladimir Veidle, "The Poison of Modernism," in Gibian and Tjalsma, *Russian Modernism*, 23–4. Zhirmunskii, "Anna Akhmatova i Aleksandr Blok" (1970), *Teoriia*, 329.

125. See Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 117, 147–8, 153–4. See also Jean-Claude Lanne, "Le Futurisme russe," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 1: 562–7.

126. See Abramovich, "O futurizme v literature," 105–6. Sergei Bobrov, "Liricheskaia tema" (1913); "Predislovie" (1914), in Markov, *Manifesty*, 99, 107–8; "Predislovie," in Aseev, *Nochnaia fleita*, 3–5. Kornei Chukovskii, "Futuristy" (1914), *Litsa*, 118, 134; *Futuristy*, 18, 25. Chulkov, "Marinetti," *Nashi sputniki*, 181–2. Ivan Kazanskii, "Pervyi god futurizma" (1912), in Markov, *Manifesty*, 31. Khovin, "Siluety," 5–7. "Ot redaktsii," *Giperborei* 1 (1912), 3.

127. Mikhail Gasparov, "Benedikt Livshits," in Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 6–7. Kunichika, *"Our Native Antiquity,"* 139–203. Livshits, "Avtobiografiia" (1929), *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 22, 26; *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 75–6, 114, 121–2, 215–16. Markov, *Russian Futurism*, 189–90. A. Rossomakhin, "K ikonografii russkogo avangarda," in Jaccard and Morard, *1913*, 303. L. Shvetsova, "Tvorcheskie printsipy i vzgliady, blizkie k ekspressionizmu," in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 275–6. Terekhina, *Ekspressionizm*, 100. R. Vroon, "Arkhaizm i futurism," in Jaccard and Morard, *1913*, 113–30.

128. See Bëm, "'Okhrannaia gramota' Borisa Pasternaka" (1931), *Issledovaniia*, 368–9. Briusov, "Novye techeniia v russkoi poezii" (1913); "Zdravogo smysla tartarary" (1914); "God russkoi poezii" (1914), *Sredi stikhov*, 385–7, 391–2, 412, 420, 422–3, 436–7, 441–3. Chukovskaia (22 October 1940), *Zapiski*, 1: 213–14. Gomolitskii, "Skit poetov" (1937); "Vakansiia poeta" (1937), *Sochineniia*, 3: 476–7, 508–9. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 104. Pasternak, *Okhrannaia gramota*, 272–3. Red'ko, "U podnozhiia" 7: 186, 194–5; *Literaturno-khudozhestvennye iskaniia*, 116–17.

129. See Baran, "K tipologii russkogo modernizma," *Poetika*, 192–3. Cassedy, *Flight*, 56–7. Mikhail Gasparov, "Antinomichnost' poetiki russkogo modernizma," in Keldysh, *Sviaz'*, 263. Lavrov, "Novye stikhi Nelli," *Russkie simvolisty*, 171–5. Markov, "Mysli," 176; *Russian Futurism*, 2, 12–13, 40. Vera Terekhina, "Antologiia-slovar' 'russkii futurizm,'" in Chénieux-Gendron, Balashova, and Gal'tsova, *Prevratnosti*, 207–9.

130. Berdiaev, *Krizis*, 16. Chulkov, "Opravdanie simvolizma," *Nashi sputniki*, 115–16, 119. Vl. V. Gippius, "Nichtozhnye slova o nizhtozhnykh delakh," 424–8, 431–2. Khudakov [Zdanevich], "Literatura," 131–2, 135–7. Shemshurin, *Futurizm*, 3–73. See also Rossomakhin, "K ikonografii russkogo avangarda," 302–13.

131. Kuzmin, "Futuristy," 21.

132. Kamenskii, "Iz istorii russkogo futurizma," 218.

133. Corbett and Thacker, "Raymond Williams," 94–6. Timothy Materer, "Make It Sell! Ezra Pound Advertizes Modernism," in Dettmar, *Marketing*, 17–20. Moody, *Ezra Pound*, 222–4.

134. Tasteven, *Futurizm*, 8–9, 19–23, 61, 75. Osip Mandel'shtam, "O prirode slova," 183, 186.

135. F. T. Marinetti, "Le Futurisme mondial," in Salaris, *Futurismi*, 21–3. Vengerova, "Angliiskie futuristy," 101. See also Markov, *Russian Futurism*, 160, 189–90, 280.

136. Vengerova, "Angliiskie futuristy," 101.

137. Cohen, *Imagining*, 121-4. Markov, *Russian Futurism*, 277.

138. Katsis, *Vladimir Maiakovskii*, 124-8. Markov, *Russian Futurism*, 278-81.

139. Berdiaev, *Krizis*, 16. Eikhenbaum, "Roman-lirika" (1921), *O literature*, 351-2. Lunts, "Tsekh," 53. On Belyi's advocacy of *zaum'*, see Sergei Postnikov to Ivanov-Razumnik (12 May 1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 217; and S. Postnikov, "Andrei Belyi, pisatel' i chelovek," ed. Ia. Leont'ev, in Boichuk, *Andrei Belyi*, 221. See also Bëm, "'Okhrannaia gramota' Borisa Pasternaka," 368-9. Gomolitskii, "Skit poetov" (1937); "Vakansiia poeta" (1937), *Sochineniia*, 3: 476-7, 508-9. Viacheslav Vs. Ivanov, "O vozdeistvii 'esteticheskogo eksperimenta' Andreia Belogo," 365. Lavrov, "Andrei Belyi i Boris Pasternak," *Andrei Belyi*, 309-10.

140. Puni, "Sovremennye gruppirovki," 2.

141. S. Vermel' (22 September 1962), "Pis'ma," 309.

142. Boris Tomashevskii, "Formal'nyi metod" (1922), in Ivanov-Razumnik, *Sovremennaia literatura*, 145-7.

143. Eikhenbaum, "Anna Akhmatova," 75. Zhirmunskii, "Anna Akhmatova i Aleksandr Blok," 334-5.

144. See Zhirmunskii, "Melodika stikha" (1922); "K voprosu o 'formal'nom metode'" (1923), *Teoriia*, 57, 91-2, 133; "Preodolevshie simvolizm" (1916); "Vokrug 'Poetiki' Opoiaza" (1919), *Poetika*, 84-5, 404. See also Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 629. Etkind, "La Crise du symbolisme et l'acméisme," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 1: 495-6. V. Khalizev, "Russkaia literatura nachala XX veka v trudakh V. M. Zhirmunskogo 1914-1921 gg.," 52.

145. Ellis, "O sovremennom simvolizme," 77. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm," *Poetika*, 364-73.

146. See explicit and implicit references to Zhirmunskii's essay: Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 377. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Slovo i kul'tura" (1921), *Sochineniia*, 2: 170. Akhmatova attended Zhirmunskii's talk in December 1916. She later recalled that the presentation had been received as "a waste of time" because, by then, its Acmeist subject matter had grown irrelevant (*Zapisnye knizhki*, 557).

147. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm," 370. See also his "Dva napravleniia sovremennoi liriki" (1920), *Poetika*, 405.

148. "Ot redaktsii," *Giperborei* 1 (1912), 3-4. On the difference of *Giperborei*'s aesthetic credo from that of Acmeism, see Gumilev (28 March 1913), in Briusov, "Perepiska s N. S. Gumilevym," 512-13. According to Akhmatova (*Zapisnye knizhki*, 376-7), this was a tactical disclaimer protecting the journal from the critical opprobrium directed at Gumilev's Acmeist program.

149. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm," 365.

150. Eikhenbaum, "Anna Akhmatova," 85-6, 88.

151. Eikhenbaum, "Roman-lirika" (1921), *O literature*, 351-2.

152. Eikhenbaum, "Anna Akhmatova," 85, 107. Zhirmunskii, "Melodika stikha" (1922), *Teoriia*, 57, 91-2.

153. Eikhenbaum, "Problemy poetiki Pushkina" (1921); "Anna Akhmatova" (1923), *O poezii*, 25, 81–5. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Slovo i kul'tura" (1921); "A. Blok" (1992), *Sochineniia*, 2: 172, 190. Zhirmunskii, "Vokrug 'Poetiki' Opoiaza" (1919); "Dva napravleniia sovremennoi liriki" (1920), *Poetika*, 84–5, 405–11; *Valerii Briusov*, 8, 50, 88, 91–3. See also Saianov, "Romantizm, realizm, naturalizm," 41–2.

154. Osip Mandel'shtam, "O prirode slova," 177.

155. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*, 5–6, 31, 61. Tynianov, "O Khlebnikove," *Problema*, 283–4.

156. For a representative list of cognomens, see Brik, "Khudozhnik-proletarii," 1. Tret'iakov, "B'em trevogu," 1–3. See Marxist reactions: Vasilii L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Futurizm," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 2: 1057. Lunacharskii, "Zametki," 226–7. Trotskii, "Futurizm" (1922), *Literatura*, 107. Valer'ian Polianskii, "Sotsial'nye korni russkoi poezii ot simvolistov do nashikh dnei," in Ezhov and Shamurin, *Russkaia poeziia*, xiii–xiv. Radlov, *O futurizme*, 30. See also Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*, 2.1: 172–5.

157. Puni, "Sovremennye gruppirovki," 2.

158. Briusov, "Novye techeniia v russkoi poezii.—Futuristy" (1913), *Sredi stikhov*, 383. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 26.

159. See D. Maksimov's attempt to apply these criteria to early modernism: "'Severnyi vestnik' i simvolisty," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 122.

160. Radlov, *O futurizme*, 30. Tret'iakov, "Otkuda i kuda?," 192–3. See also Shapirshtein-Lers, *Obshchestvennyi smysl*, 34, 52, 55, 59, 62–3, 75.

161. Avrelii [Briusov], "A. L. Volynskii," 67–8. Belyi, "Neskol'ko slov," 67; "Vol'nootpushchenniki," 71–2. Briusov, "D. S. Merezhkovskii" (1907), *Dalekie*, 57. Grabar', "Pis'ma," 75.

162. Compagnon, *Cinq paradoxes*, 49–53. Cottington, *Avant-Garde*, 5–6. Egbert, *Social Radicalism*, 121–3.

163. Briusov, "Smysl sovremennoi poezii" (1920), *Sredi stikhov*, 543. Kornei Chukovskii, "Russkaia literatura <v 1907 godu>," 552–3. For Marxist usage, see V. Shuliatikov, "Vosstanovlenie razrushennoi estetiki," in Dorovatovskii and Charushnikov, *Ocherki*, 630.

164. Jean Salot [Erenburg], "Russkaia poeziia," 8–9. See also "Torzhestvuiushchii oboz," 2.

165. Iashchenko, "O novykh putiakh," 1. Erenburg, "Novoe iskusstvo," 11–12.

166. Mikhail Kuzmin, "Valerii Briusov" (1924), in Briusov, "Letters of V. Ja. Brjusov," 69.

167. Adamovich, "Neznakomka," 16. Bontempelli, "Définitions," 178–9. Terapiano, "Zhurnal," 26.

168. Khodasevich, "Letuchie listy," 3–4. Poplavskii, "Vokrug 'Chisel,'" 205.

169. Kogan, "Serafimovich," 139–40. B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 4–5.

Karl Radek, "Sovremennaia mirovaia literatura i zadachi proletarskogo iskusstva," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s"ezd*, 317.

170. Tynianov, "Promezhutok," *Poetika*, 169. See also Erenburg, "Novaia proza," 2.

171. See Briusov, "Ippolit Sokolov. Ekspressionizm" (1920); "Smysl sovremennoi poezii" (1920); "Sredi stikhov" (1923), *Sredi stikhov*, 533–4, 543, 643–6. For a complete list of group monikers in early Soviet literary life, see Nikitina, *Russkaia literatura*, 115–42. Ocheretiansky, *Literature*, passim.

172. Adamovich, "Poety," 2. Ezhov and Shamurin, *Russkaia poeziia*, v. Khodasevich, "Chisla," 3. Kogan, "Russkaia literatura," 240–1. Lezhnev, "Il'ia Sel'vinskii i konstruktivizm" (1927); "Razgovor v serdtsakh" (1929), *O literature*, 109–10, 207. V. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Imazhinizm," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 1: 288; *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 260. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Pis'mo o russkoi poezii" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 266. Nikitina, *Russkaia literatura*, 11. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Ocherki literaturnogo dvizheniia revoliutsionnoi epokhi" (1927), *O literature*, 403–4. Jean Salot [Erenburg], "Russkaia poeziia," 9. Shamurin, "Osnovnye techeniia v dorevoliutsionnoi russkoi poezii XX veka," xxxiii. Tsetlin, "Plemia," 334–5.

173. Briusov, "Smysl sovremennoi poezii" (1920); "Sredi stikhov" (1922); "Sredi stikhov" (1923), *Sredi stikhov*, 534–43, 558, 642; "Vchera," 49–52. See also Lekmanov, *Kniga*, 136–8.

174. Lezhnev, "'Levoe' iskusstvo i ego sotsial'nyi smysl," "Razgovor v serdtsakh" (1929), *O literature*, 93, 105–7. Saianov, "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," *Ot klassikov*, 157–8. Vermel', "Poeziia," 33.

175. Oksenov, "Pis'ma," 30.

176. Al'medingen, "Zapiski," 22. Vasilii L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Dekadent," *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 1: 190. Verkhovskii, "O poetakh," 8.

177. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Predislovie," *Sovremennaia literatura*, 3. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Vypad" (1923), *Sochineniia*, 2: 211–12. Vsevolod Rozhdestvenskii concurrently attempted to construct another modernist tradition—"the Petersburg school" ("Peterburgskaia shkola," 1–3).

178. Belyi, "Tiazhelaia lira," 378–87; *Pochemu*, 125; "Material k biografii," in Lavrov, *Andrei Belyi*, 146; "Literatura i krizis zhizni" (1925), in Bogomolov, "Ob Andree Belom," *Russkaia literatura*, 476. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nekrasov i my," 3. Ivanov-Razumnik, "*Russkaia literatura XX veka*," 60; *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 22–35; "Vzgliad i nechto" (1924–25), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 519. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*, 5, 31, 61. Kuzmin, "Valerii Briusov," 69. L'vov-Rogachevskii, *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 92, 132–3, 182. Maksimov, "Novyi put'," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 133–253. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Buria i natisk" (1923); *Shum vremeni* (1925), *Sochineniia*, 2: 39, 282. Medvedev, "In Memoriam," *Pamiati*, 41–2. Piast, *Vstrechi*, 7. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 168. Prishvin, "Nachalo veka" (1926), *Rannii dnevnik*, 295–300. Red'ko, *Literaturno-khudozhestvennye iskaniia*, 7,

89–93, 142–3. Reisner, "Bogema," 89. Vikentii Veresaev, "Vospominaniia o Leonide Andreeve," in Andreev and Beklemisheva, *Rekviem*, 151.

179. Aseev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 70. Gorodetskii, "Obzor," 281. Lezhnev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 110.

180. Shamurin, "Osnovnye techeniia v dorevoliutsionnoi russkoi poezii XX veka," xix. For more examples, see Gorbov, "A. Kuprin," *Poiski*, 205–6. Saianov, "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," 88–9.

181. Ezhov and Shamurin, *Russkaia poeziia*, passim. Khovin, "Nashi literaturnye techeniia," 2. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Simvolizm," *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 2: 784.

182. See "Predislovie," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 1: i–ii. Nikitina, *Russkaia literatura*, 60–1. Shamurin, "Osnovnye techeniia v dorevoliutsionnoi russkoi poezii XX veka," xix–xxi.

183. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Khudozhestvennoe tvorchestvo," 22. See also Volkov, "Sotsialisticheskii realizm," 2.

184. Zhukov, "Protiv klichek," 256–61. See also Nikitina, *Russkaia literatura*, 10.

185. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Preodolenie," 190–2. Tal'nikov, "Literaturnye zametki," 193–4, 198.

186. Lezhnev, "'Levoe' iskusstvo i ego sotsial'nyi smysl," 90. Nikitina, *Russkaia literatura*, 10. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Oktiabr' i khudozhestvennaia literatura," *O sovremennoi literature*, 253–69. Tret'iakov, "B'em trevogu," 1–3.

187. See B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 10–12, 333–55, 384; "Simvolizm," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, 10: 713. Nikitina, *Russkaia literatura*, 7. Saianov, "Romantizm, realizm, naturalizm"; "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," 43–4, 93–9, 119, 138–45. Selivanovskii, *Ocherki*, 48, 52, 67–68. Volkov, *Poeziia*, 9n1.

188. Abramov, "Vysokolobyi," 1. Frid, "Pol' Valeri," 157–8, 162. Gal'perina, "Marsel' Prust," 153–77. Gor'kii, "O formalizme," 2. Gorodetskii, "Protiv bessoderzhatel'noi formy," 3. Miller-Budnitskaia, "Ob 'Ulisse,'" 177–9. Dmitrii Mirskii, "Realizm" (1935), *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia*, 9: 566–7. Selivanovskii, "Dary," 2. Startsev, "Eksperiment," 70–2; "Dzheims Dzhois," 5. "Usilit' bor'bu s formalizmom," 1. Zelinskii, "K voprosu," 2.

189. Anisimov, "O nasledstve," 1.

190. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 466, 469, 605.

191. "Ot redaktsii"; Asmus, "Filosofiia i estetika russkogo simvolizma"; Orlov, "Iz literaturnogo nasledstva," i, 24–5, 401.

192. Chukovskaia (8 and 19 August 1940; 13 June 1952), *Zapiski*, 1: 171–2, 183; 2: 46. Erberg, "Vospominaniia," 233. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 40-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 165. Zhirmunskii, *Drama*, 20, 22, 30.

193. Adamovich, "Poety," 2; "Na polustankakh," 2; "Literaturnye besedy" (2 March 1925), 2. "Filosoficheskoe obosnovanie blagonamerennosti," 6–10. Khodasevich, "Chisla," 3. Mochul'skii, "O literaturnoi kritike," 2; "Lirika," 2. Tsetlin, "Plemia," 334–5.

194. Dubinskii, "Mysli," 245–6. Mirskii, "Konst. Fedin," 432. Muratov, "Iskusstvo," 245. Shletser, "O modernistakh," 2–3.

195. "Beseda o russkom simvolizme," 8. Georgii Ivanov, "V. Sirin," 235. Artur Lur'e, "Puti," 220–1, 225–6. Mirskii, "Literaturnaia Rossiia," 474. Mochul'skii, "Lirika," 2. Poplavskii, "Molodaia russkaia zhivopis'," 193. Veidle, "Mir Iskusstva," 25–6; "O frantsuzskoi literature," 493. Zaitsev, "Andrei Belyi," 81–4.

196. Artur Lur'e, "Muzyka," 119–22. See also his "Kaprizy i liki" (1916), in Kazanskaia, "Artur Lur'e," 64–5.

197. Stepun, "Porevoliutsionnoe soznanie," 15–16. See also his *Byvshee*, 129, 163, 206–7.

198. Mirskii, "Valerii Iakovlevich Briusov," 415–16; "Contemporary Movements in Russian Literature," *Uncollected Writings*, 259, 263.

199. Khodasevich, "Briusov" (1924); "Pamiati B. A. Sadovskogo" (1925), *Nekropol'*, 34, 326.

200. Khodasevich, "Muni" (1926), *Nekropol'*, 74; "O simvolizme" (1928), *Literaturnye stat'i*, 155.

201. Khodasevich, "O forme i soderzhanii" (1933), *Koleblemyi trenozhnik*, 592.

202. John Malmstad, "Vospominaiia 'fanatika i skeptika,'" in Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 398–401. Viacheslav Ivanov to Vadim Rudnev (14 July 1938), ed. A. Shishkin, in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 3: 976.

203. Bëm, "Chisla" (1931); "Ob 'upadochnom' periode russkoi literatury" (1931); "Ispoved' 'geroia nashego vremeni'" (1935), *Pis'ma*, 71–4, 90–3, 219–20. Z. Gippius, "U kogo," 3; letter to M. Vishniak (5 July 1931), ed. N. Bogomolov, in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 3: 409. Tsvetaeva, "Poet," 115.

204. Mirskii, *Contemporary Russian Literature*, 181. Veidle, "O frantsuzskoi literature," 491–6; "Onzième réunion," in *Studio franco-russe*, 384.

205. See the second soirée (26 November 1929), devoted to Russian-French literary commerce, and the eleventh meeting (16 December 1930), entitled "Symbolism in France and in Russia" (*Studio franco-russe*, 79–80, 364–97).

206. Nina Berberova, "Le Symbolisme russe" (1930), in *Studio franco-russe*, 375.

207. Nabokov, *Dar*, *Sobranie*, 4: 244, 330; *Gift*, 58–9, 149; *Real Life of Sebastian Knight*, 114.

208. Adamovich, "O Bunine," 2; "'Ocherki po istorii russkoi kul'tury' P. N. Miliukova" (1931), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 470–1; "Litsa i knigi," 324–5, 329.

209. Bëm, "Pravda proshlogo" (1933), *Pis'ma*, 115. Anton Krainii [Z. Gippius], "Literaturnye razmyshleniia," 148.

210. Otsup, "Serebrianyi vek," 174; "Klim Samgin," 181.

211. Tsvetaeva, "Poet," 115; "Moi Pushkin," 224. See also Berdiaev, *Samopoznanie*, 148, 244–6.

212. Gleb Struve, *25 Years*, 249, 255. Originally written in 1935.

213. Adamovich, "'Chisla.' Kniga 7–8" (1933), *Literaturnye zametki*, 2: 176–7.

214. "Ot redaktsii," *Chisla* 1 (1930), 5–6.

215. Pound, "Small Magazines," 702–3.

216. Adamovich, "Stikhi" (1932), *Literaturnye zametki*, 2: 107–8; "Poeziia v emigratsii," 53, 57.

217. Fedotov, "O smerti," 143. "Politika i iskusstvo. Vecher 'Chisel,'" 260.

218. Khodasevich, "Chisla," 3.

219. Poplavskii, "Vokrug 'Chisel,'" 204.

220. Sharshun, "Magicheskii realism," 229–31. See also Bëm, "Magicheskii realizm" (1932), *Pis´ma*, 110–13.

221. Bëm, "O dvukh napravleniiakh v sovremennoi poezii" (1934); "Vne zhizni" (1936), *Pis´ma*, 198, 266–7. For a detailed study of the *Chisla* group, see Leonid Livak, *How It Was Done in Paris* (2003).

222. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (23 January 1927), 1–2.

223. See V. Pertsov, "Realizm i modernistskie techeniia v russkoi literature nachala XX veka"; G. Nedoshivin, "Vopros o realizme"; D. Markov, "Nekotorye protsessy v bolgarskoi literature kontsa XIX–nachala XX veka i voprosy teorii realizma"; A. Lavretskii, "Po povodu termina 'kriticheskii realizm'"; B. Bialik, "Terminy i poniatiia," in Anisimov and El´sberg, *Problemy*, 148–78, 519, 531–6, 546–51.

224. Zhirmunskii, "Literaturnye techeniia kak iavlenie mezhdunarodnoe," *Sravnitel´noe literaturovedenie*, 145–6. For similar contemporary usage, see B. Rostotskii, "Modernizm v teatre," in Alekseev et al., *Russkaia khudozhestvennaia kul´tura*, 178.

225. B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 10–12, 19–21.

226. B. Bialik, "Vvedenie"; Tager, "Vozniknovenie modernizma," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 20, 189–209. El´sberg, "Realizm i modernizm," in Samarin, Khrapchenko, and El´sberg, *Realizm*, 246–7. Losev, "Modernistskaia model´," 136–40. B. Mikhailovskii, "Simvolizm," in Bialik, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 236–71. Zhirmunskii, "Anna Akhmatova i Aleksandr Blok," 329, 345–46. See also Rougle, "Recent Soviet Approaches," 387–400. Tall, "Soviet Debate," 8–19.

227. Terras, *Belinskij*, 6.

228. Makovskii, *Na Parnase*, 9–11, 363.

229. Gleb Struve, *Soviet Russian Literature*, 3. Otsup, "Serebrianyi vek russkoi poezii," *Sovremenniki*, 127.

230. Makovskii, *Na Parnase*, 16–18. Zaitsev, "Serebrianyi vek," *Sobranie*, 2: 470–81.

231. Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 318, 540, 617. N. Mandel´shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 287. Zhirmunskii, "Anna Akhmatova i Aleksandr Blok," 342.

232. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Tri bogatyria," 5. Piast, *Vstrechi*, 7. Otsup, "Serebrianyi vek," 175–8. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 318. See also Ronen, *Serebrianyi vek*, 29–98. Rylkova, *Archaeology*.

233. Ronen, *Serebrianyi vek*, 113. Rylkova, "Na sklone," 231–44. See also Lavrov, "Serebianyi vek," 240–7. Reitblat, "'<. . .> chto blestit'?," 241–51.

234. Alexander Dolinin, "Propushchennye zven'ia v istorii termina 'serebrianyi vek.'" Ivask, "Serebrianyi vek," 11: 11–12; 12: 11–12.

235. Markov, "Mysli," 169. See also Georgii Ivanov (14 October 1955), in Ivanov and Odoevtseva, *Briefe*, 3.

236. Adamovich, *Kommentarii*, 495–7. See also Veidle, "Pasternak," 156–63.

237. Markov, "Mysli," 169–70.

238. Baran, "Pushkin v tvorchestve Khlebnikova" (1992), *Poetika*, 155. Dobrenko, *Formovka*, 86, 97. Etkind, "Edinstvo 'serebrianogo veka,'" in Etkind et al., *Letteratura*, 26–7, 30–1. Fink, *Bergson*, xvii, 44–5, 113. Boris Gasparov, introduction to Gasparov, Hughes, and Paperno, *Cultural Mythologies*, 1–2. Terras, *History*, 385–92, 415. Mikhail Gasparov, "Antinomichnost' poetiki russkogo modernizma," 263.

239. See Lekmanov, "Kontseptsiia 'Serebrianogo veka,'" 218.

240. Mikhail Gasparov, "Benedikt Livshits," 6–7.

241. Lekmanov, "Kontseptsiia 'Serebrianogo veka,'" 216–17. Mickiewicz, "Problem," 3–16. Timenchik, "Zametki," 3.2–3: 23.

242. See Lekmanov, "Kontseptsiia 'Serebrianogo veka,'" 219–30. Segal, "Russkaia semanticheskaia poetika," 7. See also Levin et al., "Russkaia semanticheskaia poetika," 47–82.

243. Donchin, *Influence*, 9–10.

244. Patricia Carden, "Ornamentalism and Modernism"; Gibian, introduction to Gibian and Tjalsma, *Russian Modernism*, 10, 49.

245. Markov, "K voprosu o granitsakh dekadansa v russkoi poezii," 53–4.

246. Ginzburg, *O literaturnom geroe*, 79; "Zapisi 40-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 165.

247. John Bowlt, "Modernism, Russian," in Terras, *Handbook of Russian Literature*, 285. See also Lipovetskii, *Russian Postmodernist Fiction*, 250n7.

248. Ginzburg, *Literatura*, 37.

249. Baran, "Fëdor Sologub i kritiki"; "K tipologii russkogo modernizma"; "Dorevoliutsionnaia prazdnichnaia literatura i russkii modernizm," *Poetika*, 207, 237–9, 259, 284, 302, 310.

250. Peterson, *History*, xii, 38. See also Malmstad, *Andrey Bely*, 10. Terras, *History*, 385, 391–2.

251. Lotman and Mints, "Epokha modernizma: 'serebrianyi vek' russkoi poezii"; "Modernizm v iskusstve i modernist v zhizni," in Mints, *Poetika*, 342–413.

252. Erlich, *Modernism*, 2. Paperno and Grossman, introduction to Paperno and Grossman, *Creating Life*, 1.

253. For the few attempts to question extant terminology, see Vittorio Strada, "La Littérature de la fin du XIXe siècle"; Rainer Grübel, "Le Constructivisme," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 1: 34, 36; 2: 742.

254. Vroon and Malmstad, preface to Vroon and Malmstad, *Readings*, 8.

255. See, for example, Smirnov and Dering-Smirnova, *Ocherki*, 72–86.

256. Nikolai Bogomolov, "Postsimvolizm," in Keldysh and Bogomolov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 387–8. Viacheslav Vs. Ivanov, "O vzaimootnoshenii simvolizma, predsimvolizma i postsimvolizma v russkoi literature kontsa XIX–nachala XX veka," *Izbrannye trudy*, 120–1.

257. The uses of post-Symbolism include a byword for Acmeism; a unifying label for Acmeism and Futurism; an umbrella term associating Socialist Realism with modernism; a blanket term for all modernist practices in the 1910s–30s, including émigré modernism; a designation for artists whose poetics exhibit traces of Symbolism. See Esaulov, *Postsimvolizm*.

258. Girin, "Problema avangarda," *Avangard*, 1: 35.

259. Eshelman, *Nikolaj Gumilev*, 10–13. Shepherd, *Beyond Metafiction*, 18n46.

260. Ivanitskaia, "Spor," 181–7. Lavrov, "Serebianyi vek," 240–2. Rylkova, "Na sklone," 236–9.

261. See, for example, Marcadé, *Le Dialogue*. Nashchokina, *Dukh simvolizma*.

Chapter 2. The Errant Compass Rose of Russian Modernist Studies

1. Davis, *Extinct Scene*, 11–14. Deborah Jacobs, "Feminist Criticism/Cultural Studies/Modernist Texts," in Rado, *Rereading*, 288. Scholes, *Paradoxy*, passim.

2. Ioffe and White, *Russian Avant-Garde*, 10. Kern, *Modernist Novel*, 1–6.

3. Edward Możejko, "Russian Modernism," in Eysteinsson and Liska, *Modernism*, 2: 891.

4. Dorovatovskii and Charushnikov, *Ocherki*, v–vi. Iashchenko, "O novykh putiakh," 1–2. Vorovskii, "O burzhuaznosti modernistov" (1908), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 197–201.

5. Ivanov-Razumnik in Aleksandr Blok, "Perepiska s R. V. Ivanovym-Razumnikom," 374. Gleb Struve, *Soviet Russian Literature*, 3–5.

6. U. Fokht, "Realizm russkoi literatury na rubezhe dvukh vekov," in Nikolaev, *Razvitie*, 9. V. Keldysh, "Novoe v kriticheskom realizme i v ego estetike"; S. Nebol'sin, "Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii russkogo modernizma v otsenkakh sovremennogo burzhuaznogo literaturovedeniia Zapada," in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 114–15, 405–6. Kuznetsov, "Sotsialisticheskii realizm," 221.

7. Korolenko, "Severnye sborniki" (1908), *Sobranie*, 8: 334–5. Mirskii, "Contemporary Movements in Russian Literature" (1928), *Uncollected Writings*, 259–63. Vengerova, "Simvolizm," 8–9.

8. Gal'perina, "Marsel' Prust," 171–2. "My dozhdemsia svoei kritiki!," 38–42. *Protiv burzhuaznogo liberalizma*, 99–104.

9. Gorbov, "10 let," 9–10, 20–8. T. Kulova, "Tvorcheskie iskaniia Leonida Andreeva," in Zhegalov et al., *Kriticheskii realizm*, 254. A. Ovcharenko, "Realizm v russkoi

literature nachala XX stoletiia," in *Problemy tipologii russkogo realizma*, 152–6. Usievich, "Maiakovskii," 4. Volkov, "Aleksandr Blok," 2.

10. For the Thaw debate, see N. Gei, "K voprosu ob opredelenii realizma"; A. Zis', "Protiv kontseptsii 'realizm-antirealizm'"; A. Sokolov, "Khudozhestvennyi metod i literaturnoe napravlenie"; G. Fridlender, "K istorii realizma"; A. Lavretskii, "Po povodu termina 'kriticheskii realizm'"; B. Bialik, "Terminy i poniatiia," in Anisimov and El'sberg, *Problemy*, 453–61, 480–96, 501–11, 531–6, 546–51. For the dogmatic applications of the realist/modernist contrast, see Kuznetsov, "Sotsialisticheskii realizm," 220–1. V. Pertsov, "Realizm i modernistskie techeniia v russkoi literature nachala XX veka," in Anisimov and El'sberg, *Problemy*, 148–72. Vanslov and Sokolov, *Modernizm*, 8–22.

11. Ginzburg, *O literaturnom geroe*, 80. See also Bronner, *Modernism*, 23–4. Matei Calinescu, "Modernism and Ideology," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 85. Thompson, *Fiction*, 37–9.

12. Fokkema, *Literary History*, 13–19. Ginzburg, *O literaturnom geroe*, 81–4.

13. Stasov, "Prosvetitel' po chasti khudozhestva" (1897); "Podvor'e prokazhennykh" (1899); "Iskusstvo XIX veka" (1901–6), *Izbrannye sochineniia*, 3: 205–14, 257–63, 614, 659.

14. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm" (1916), *Poetika*, 388.

15. Zhirmunskii, *Nemetskii romantizm*, 129, 140–1, 190–4.

16. See, for example, Belyi, "Teatr i sovremennaia drama" (1907), *Arabeski*, 17–36.

17. Red'ko, *Literaturno-khudozhestvennye iskaniia*, 116–17, 141. Zhirmunskii, *Nemetskii romantizm*, 12–13. The primacy of metaphysics over depth psychology in early modernism is visible in Ivan Konevskoi's letters to Ivan Bilibin (28 June and 8 July 1897), in A. Lavrov, "Iz arkhiva Ivana Konevskogo" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 155, 162).

18. Auerbach, *Mimesis*, 534–46. Pound, "James Joyce et Pécuchet," *Pound/Joyce*, 208. Woolf, "Modern Fiction" (1919), *Essays*, 4: 158–62. See also Eysteinsson, *Concept*, 184. Levenson, *Modernism*, 90–1.

19. Terent'ev, "Traktat o sploshnom neprilichii" (1920), *Sobranie*, 272. Gayraud, "Iliazd," 112. Gurianova, *Aesthetics*, 135.

20. Pavel Filonov to M. Matiushin (1914), in Malmstad, "From the History of the Russian Avant-Garde" (Vroon and Malmstad, *Readings*, 214). Viach. Ivanov, "Dve stikhii v sovremennom simvolizme," 87–93; "Estetika i ispovedanie," 48; "Mysli o simvolizme," 9–10; "Lev Tolstoi i kul'tura" (1911); "O granitsakh iskusstva" (1913), *Borozdy*, 92–3, 206–15. Chuzhak, "Pod znakom," 12–22. "Lef i MAPP," 3. Loks, "Sovremennaia proza" 5: 85–6. Lunts, "Pochemu," 31. "Ot redaktsii," *Zolotoe runo* 11–12 (1909), 106. Sharshun, "Magicheskii realizm," 229–31. Shaginian, *Literaturnyi dnevnik*, 13–14. Turintsev, "Opyt," 214–16.

21. Anichkov, *Realizm*, 3, 67, 83–4. Belyi, "Vishnevyi sad," 46; "Chekhov," 3; "Detskaia svistul'ka," 54–5; "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," 42–3. Ber-

diaev, "Dekadentstvo," 121–3. Briusov, "Sviashchennaia zhertva," 26–7. Chulkov, "Pamiati Vrubelia," *Nashi sputniki*, 97. Ellis, "O sovremennom simvolizme," 75–6. M. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm i dekadentstvo" (1907), *Kniga*, 24–6. V. Gofman, "A. Fedorov," 56–7. Gureev, "Idealisty," 89–91. Tal'nikov, "Simvolizm," 124–48. Toporkov, "O novom realizme," 47. Zinov'eva-Annibal, "Henry James. The Golden Bowl," *Tridtsat' tri uroda*, 425–6.

22. Fink, *Bergson*, 44–114.

23. Bal'mont, "Elementarnye slova o simvolicheskoi poezii," *Gornye vershiny*, 77. Belyi, "Vihnevyi sad," 47. Briusov, "N. Minskii" (1908), *Dalekie*, 49; "Fëdor Sologub," 51. Viach. Ivanov, "Poet," 6. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 32–4; *Russkaia literatura ot semidesiatykh godov*, 378–9. Merezhkovskii, "O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniiakh sovremennoi russkoi literatury" (1892–93), *Izbrannye stat'i*, 248–50. Zhirmunskii, *Nemetskii romantizm*, 195.

24. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (28 December 1925), 2; (16 January 1927), 1–2; "'Chisla.' Kniga chetvertaia" (1931), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 464. Chulkov, "F. I. Tiutchev"; "Iskhod," *Pokryvalo*, 45–54, 76. Vl. Gippius, "Nichtozhnye slova o nichtozhnykh delakh" (1913), ed. A. Mets, in Bagno, Malmstad, and Malikova, *Na rubezhe*, 431–2. M. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm i dekadentstvo," 25–6. Gumilev, "Nasledie," 44. Il'iazd [Zdanevich], "Les nouvelles écoles dans la poésie russe" (1921), in Gayraud, "Iliazd," 114. Aleksei Kruchenykh, "Deklaratsiia slova, kak takovogo" (1913), in Markov, *Manifesty*, 63. Maiakovskii, "Nekrolog," 303. Merezhkovskii, "O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniiakh," 248–50. Poplavskii, "Literaturnaia anketa," 287. Terapiano, "Chelovek," 211–12.

25. Loks, "Sovremennaia proza" 7: 75. Saianov, "Romantizm, realizm, naturalizm," *Ot klassikov*, 37–8, 74–5. See also G. Pospelov, "Realizm i ego raznovidnosti v russkoi literature XIX v."; S. Mashinskii, "Tipologicheskoe i konkretno-istoricheskoe issledovanie literatury," in *Problemy tipologii russkogo realizma*, 90, 134.

26. Jakobson, "On Realism in Art," *Language*, 20–5.

27. Stephen Arata, "Realism," in Marshall, *Fin de Siècle*, 172.

28. Baudelaire, "Madame Bovary," *Œuvres*, 2: 80. Bowra, *Romantic Imagination*, 7–23, 198–9. Peter Brooks, *Realist Vision*, 71–3. Egbert, *Social Radicalism*, 189–90. Eliot, "Baudelaire," *Selected Essays*, 424. Clement Greenberg, "The Notion of 'Postmodern,'" in Hoesterey, *Zeitgeist*, 45. Hutchinson, *Modernism*, 94–5. Scholes and Wulfman, *Modernism*, 3.

29. Silverman, *Art Nouveau*, 23–4.

30. Bernheimer, *Decadent Subjects*, 58, 71. Silverman, *Art Nouveau*, 9–10, 78–84.

31. Rozanov, *Dekadenty*, 10–16.

32. Fedotov, "Bor'ba," 33–6.

33. Paperno, *Chernyshevsky*, 7–12.

34. Vl. Gippius, "O novoi tochke zreniia," 24. Merezhkovskii, "O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniiakh," 304.

35. Ellis, "Ob al'manakhakh," 70. See also Clowes, *Revolution*, 40. Ekonen, *Tvorets*, 56–58. Olga Matich, "Dialectics of Cultural Return," in Gasparov, Hughes, and Paperno, *Cultural Mythologies*, 60–1. Paperno, *Chernyshevsky*, 3–5.

36. Burenin, "Literaturnye chteniia i sobesedovaniia v obshchestve 'bedlam-modern,'" *Gore*, 73, 99.

37. Belyi to N. Petrovskaia (21 June 1904), in Lavrov, *Andrei Belyi*, 389. See also Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.2: 113; 3.3: 18. Pustygina, "K izucheniiu evoliutsii," 143.

38. Zhirmunskii, *Nemetskii romantizm*, 129, 140–1, 190–6.

39. Nabokov, *Gift*, 242–3; *Dar*, *Sobranie*, 4: 420–1.

40. Nina Berberova, "Le Symbolisme russe" (1930), in *Studio franco-russe*, 374–5. Aleksandr Blok, "O sovremennoi kritike" (1907), *Sobranie*, 5: 205–7. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nekrasov i my," 3; "Nekrasov i modernisty," *Litsa*, 214–16. "Dmitrii Sergeevich Merezhkovskii," in *Russkaia kritika*, 80–1. Khodasevich, "O forme i soderzhanii" (1933), *Koleblemyi trenozhnik*, 591–2. Osip Mandel'shtam, *Shum vremeni* (1925), *Sochineniia*, 2: 39. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 176–7. P. Struve, "Pochemu," 117. See also Keys, *Reluctant Modernist*, 25, 87. Lavrov, "Z. N. Gippius i ee poeticheskii dnevnik," *Russkie simvolisty*, 46–50. M. Nikitina, "'Zavety' realizma v romanakh starshikh simvolistov," in Keldysh, *Sviaz'*, 206–22. Terras, *Belinskij*, 226–9.

41. Belyi, "Nastoiashchee," 63–4; "Problema kul'tury" (1909), *Simvolizm*, 8–9. Chulkov, "Opravdanie zemli," *Pokryvalo*, 102, 106. Filosofov, "Natsionalizm," 209–11. Vl. Gippius, "O novoi tochke zreniia," 22. Minskii, "Iz zapisnoi knizhki," 24.

42. Belyi, "V zashchitu," 40. Briusov, "Sviashchennaia zhertva," 25–26; "D. S. Merezhkovskii" (1907), *Dalekie*, 57–63. See also Mikhail Gasparov, "Antinomichnost' poetiki russkogo modernizma," in Keldysh, *Sviaz'*, 261–2.

43. Merezhkovskii, "O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniiakh," 288. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 75. Gorky to Chekhov (5 January 1900), in Chekhov, *Perepiska*, 2: 326.

44. Chulkov, "Pamiati Chekhova," *Pokryvalo*, 164–8. M. Gofman, "Romantizm, simvolizm i dekadentstvo," 12. Gurevich, "Posmertnyi lik Chekhova" (1910), *Literatura*, 46–7, 54. For Soviet critical reactions, see E. Polotskaia, "Realizm Chekhova," in Nikolaev, *Razvitie*, 106.

45. Chekhov to Sergei Diagilev (30 December 1902; 12 July 1903), *Polnoe sobranie* (*Pis'ma*), 11: 106, 234. Merezhkovskii, "O Chekhove," 9–10. See also Shcherbenok, "Killing Realism," 297–316.

46. Arkadii Gornfel'd, "Zametka o realizme," in *Russkaia kritika*, 61–3. Red'ko, *Literaturno-khudozhestvennye iskaniia*, 90.

47. Belyi, "Vishnevyi sad," 46; "Chekhov," 3; "A. P. Chekhov" (1907), *Arabeski*, 395–400; "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," 39. See also Vadim Polonskii, *Mezhdu traditsiei*, 156–93.

48. Adamovich, "Ob M. Kuzmine," 2. Levenson, *Modernism*, 90–1. Gleb Struve, *Soviet Russian Literature*, 4–5.

49. Boris Gasparov, "Poetry of the Silver Age," in Dobrenko and Balina, *Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*, 12–13. Mickiewicz, "Problem," 8; "Acmeist Conception," 72.

50. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Utro akmeizma" (1912/1919); "O prirode slova" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 142, 176–7, 185–7. See also A. Mets, "Epizod iz istorii akmeizma," in Toddes, *Piatye tynianovskie chteniia*, 115.

51. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm," 366–404; "Poetika Aleksandra Bloka" (1921), *Teoriia*, 227. See Zhirmunskii's disclaimer in his *Voprosy*, 322. See also V. Khalizev, "Russkaia literatura nachala XX veka v trudakh V. M. Zhirmunskogo 1914–1921 gg.," in Esaulov, *Postsimvolizm*, 2: 50–2.

52. Arkadii Dolinin, "Akmeizm," 161. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Simvolisty," 7: 305–7. Red'ko, *Literaturno-khudozhestvennye iskaniia*, 95. See also Markov, "K voprosu o granitsakh dekadansa v russkoi poezii," *O svobode*, 48.

53. Briusov, "Novye techeniia v russkoi poezii" (1913), *Sredi stikhov*, 398. Chulkov, "Opravdanie simvolizma," *Nashi sputniki*, 111–12. Khovin, "Modernizirovannyi Adam," 13–14.

54. Fedotov, "Bor'ba," 39–41.

55. Mustangova, "Poeticheskie traditsii," 1–2. Oksenov, "Sovetskaia poeziia," 3. Saianov, "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," *Ot klassikov*, 156.

56. Gorodetskii, "Protiv bessoderzhatel'noi formy," 3. Selivanovskii, "V zashchitu," 4; *Ocherki*, 59–60, 65–6. Volkov, "Sotsialisticheskii realizm," 2.

57. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 777. V. Keldysh, "Novoe v kriticheskom realizme i v ego estetike," in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 114–15. Markov, "Mysli," 180.

58. Nikolai Bogomolov, "Prose between Symbolism and Realism," in Dobrenko and Balina, *Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*, 35–7; "Serebrianyi vek," in Lanne, *Âge*, 134–7. Fëdor Dviniatin, "Nabokov, modernizm, postmodernizm i mimesis," in Leving and Soshkin, *Imperiia N*, 442–4. Serge Rolet, "L'Âge d'argent et ses repoussoirs," in Lanne, *Âge*, 45–57. For the realist/modernist dichotomy in post-Soviet scholarship, see Davydova, *Russkii neorealizm*, 23–31. Keldysh and Bogomolov, "Realizm i 'neorealizm,'" *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 259–335. Tuzkov and Tuzkova, *Neorealizm*, 5.

59. Apostolov, *Impressionizm*, 22. F. Batiushkov, "Bunin," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 344, 351. Belyi, "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," 41–4. Chulkov, "Iskhod," *Pokryvalo*, 76. Fedotov, "Bor'ba," 33–4. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 34–7; "Vzgliad i nechto" (1924–25), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 524. P. Kogan, "Chto zhdet nashu literaturu"; "Beseda s S. A. Vengerovym," in *Kuda my idem?*, 23–4, 87; *Ocherki*, 3.1: 49, 106–8, 113, 126. Slonim, "Desiat' let russkoi literatury," 11–12: 92–3. See also M. Svichenskaia, "Izdatel'stvo 'Znanie,'" in Frolova, *Kniga*, 149–53.

60. Andreev to Gorky (23/26 December 1912), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 351.

61. Belyi, "Detskaia svistul'ka," 54. Ellis, "Ob al'manakhakh," 70. Filosofov, "Dela," 3. Gornfel'd, "Smert' byta," *Knigi*, 286–7. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.1: 106–13, 126. L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Byt' ili ne byt'," 81–5.

62. Aseev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 70. Iu. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 1: 5–21.

63. Anichkov, "Poslednie pobegi," 104–5. Belyi, "A. P. Chekhov" (1907), *Arabeski*, 395–400. Aleksandr Blok, "O sovremennom sostoianii russkogo simvolizma" (1910), *Sobranie*, 5: 432–4. Ellis, "Nashi epigony," 63–8; "V zashchitu dekadentstva," in Ermichev, *N. A. Berdiaev*, 1: 168; "Literaturnyi nevod," 84–5. Sergei Solov'ev, "Ivan Bunin," 89.

64. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 154. Belyi, "Literaturno-khudozhestvennye al'manakhi," 94. Kornei Chukovskii, "Russkaia literatura <v 1907 godu>" (1908), *Sobranie*, 6: 551–2. Ellis, "Literaturno-khudozhestvennye al'manakhi," 66–8. L'vov-Rogachevskii, *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 182. See also Baran, "Fëdor Sologub i kritiki," *Poetika*, 238–9. D. Sherikh, "Izdatel'stvo 'Shipovnik'"; M. Svichenskaia, "Izdatel'stvo 'Znanie,'" in Frolova, *Kniga*, 153–5,165–6.

65. Briusov, "Athenaeum," 48–9. Kornei Chukovskii, "Pshibyshevskii," 37. Iarkov, "Sbornik," 56–7. Kursinskii, "L. Andreev," 85. Pant-ov, "Sbornik," 52. I. Smirnov, "Sborniki," 47.

66. The Andreev-Gorky correspondence (13 August 1907; 1–13 March 1908), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 290–2, 306. Andreev to A. Amfiteatrov (1913), in Beklemisheva, "Vospominaniia o Leonide Andreeve" (Andreev and Beklemisheva, *Rekviem*, 259–62). See also "Beseda s Borisom Zaitsevym," in Guerra, *"Kogda my v Rossiiu vernemsia,"* 69. Kornei Chukovskii, "Novaia povest' L. Andreeva" (1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 439. Poves and Kogan, *Modernisty*, 39. Vengerov, "Pobediteli ili pobezhdennye?," *Osnovnye cherty*, 58; "Etapy neo-romanticheskogo dvizheniia," *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 16–18. V. Veresaev, "Vospominaniia o Leonide Andreeve," in Andreev and Beklemisheva, *Rekviem*, 151.

67. Aseev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 70. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 183–4, 467, 615–18. L'vov-Rogachevskii, *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 182. Kulova, "Tvorcheskie iskaniia Leonida Andreeva," 254–84. B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 332. Aleksandr Ovcharenko, "Realizm v russkoi literature nachala XX stoletiia," in *Problemy tipologii russkogo realizma*, 152–3.

68. See Ellis, "Materialy dlia literaturnogo manifesta" (1907); and his letter to Briusov (17 September 1907), in Lavrov, "Ellis v 'Vesakh'" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 293–4, 312).

69. Belyi, "Anatema," 103–5. Ellis, "Krizis," 63–5; "Literaturnyi nevod," 84–5; "Nashi epigony," 61–4. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura ot semidesiatykh godov*, 378–9; *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 32–4; "*Russkaia literatura XX veka*," 60. Sergei Solov'ev, "Simvolizm," 56.

70. Andreev to A. Amfiteatrov (1913), in Beklemisheva, "Vospominaniia o Leonide

Andreeve," 260–1. See also Belyi, "Vol'nootpushchenniki," 68–72; "A. P. Chekhov" (1907), *Arabeski*, 395–400. Kornei Chudovskii, "Zametki," 54. Ellis, "Esche odna korona," 63; "Nashi epigony," 63–8; letter to Briusov (June–July 1907), in Lavrov, "Ellis v 'Vesakh'" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 303–4).

71. Kornei Chukovskii, "O Leonide Andreeve," *Litsa*, 56–62. L. Kozlovskii, "Leonid Andreev," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 253–80. For a distinction between Symbolist and allegorical art, see Briusov, "Dialog o realizme v iskusstve" (1906), *Sredi stikhov*, 184–5.

72. Aleksandr Blok, "O sovremennoi kritike," 205–6. Briusov, "N. Gumilev. *Zhemchuga*" (1910), *Dalekie*, 145–6. Viach. Ivanov, "Dve stikhii," 87–93. "Ot redaktsii," *Zolotoe runo* 11–12 (1909), 106. Vengerov, "Pobediteli ili pobezhdennye?," 42–58.

73. Arkadii Gornfel'd, "Fëdor Sologub," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 15–16. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 12–13. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 179–80.

74. Aleksandr Blok, "O realistakh" (1907), *Sobranie*, 5: 125–9. Zinov'eva-Annibal, "Obozrenie," 83–4.

75. Mirskii, "Contemporary Movements in Russian Literature," *Uncollected Writings*, 265–6.

76. E. Starikova, "Realizm i simvolizm," in Nikolaev, *Razvitie*, 180–91.

77. Zinov'eva-Annibal, "A. Remizov. 'Prud,' roman" (1905), *Tridtsat' tri uroda*, 431.

78. Golovin, "Fëdor Sologub," 304. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 167–8. Slonim, "Fëdor Sologub," 278–9.

79. Belyi, "Ob itogakh razvitiia novogo russkogo iskusstva" (1907), *Arabeski*, 259. Kornei Chukovskii, "Fëdor Sologub," *Ot Chekhova*, 171–81. Ellis, *Russkie simvolisty*, 228. See also Briusov, "Fëdor Sologub," 50–1. Chulkov, "Okolo byta," *Pokryvalo*, 111.

80. Tal'nikov, "Simvolizm," 130–1.

81. Baran, "Fëdor Sologub i kritiki," *Poetika*, 240–5. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 177–80. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.1: 106–8; 3.2: 149–58. For Sologub in Stalinist criticism, see *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 607, 616, 793. B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 283, 288.

82. Belyi, "Simvolizm kak miroponimanie," 177.

83. Amfiteatrov, "Literaturnye vpechatleniia," 319–20. Berdiaev, "Russkii soblazn," 104. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 34–37; "Tvorchestvo A. Remizova," *Tvorchestvo*, 1: 80–2. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.3: 133. Kuzmin, "Khudozhestvennaia proza," 39–40. Prishvin, "Okhota za schast'em" (1926), *Sobranie*, 3: 13. Slonim, "Desiat' let russkoi literatury," 11–12: 112–14.

84. Gorbov, "Feniks," 229. Loks, "Sovremennaia proza," 5: 82. Mirskii, "I. Babel'," 486–7. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Preodolenie," 190–2. Slonim, *Portrety*, 123–34; "O sovremennoi literature," 129–30; "Desiat' let russkoi literatury," 10: 68–74; 11–12: 94–112. See also Medaric, "Vladimir Nabokov i roman XX stoletiia," 80–1, 96–8.

85. Zamiatin, "Novaia russkaia proza" (1923), *Litsa*, 208–10; "Belaia liubov'" (1924), in Ivanov-Razumnik, *Sovremennaia literatura*, 80–1.

86. Bëm, "O Evgenii Zamiatine" (1937), *Pis'ma*, 291–2. Slonim, *Portrety*, 56–7. Turintsev, "Opyt," 216–17, 226–7.

87. Russell, "The Modernist Tradition," in Jones and Feuer, *Cambridge Companion*, 227.

88. Emerson, *Cambridge Introduction*, 170–8.

89. D. Blagoi, "Osobennosti russkogo realizma XIX veka," in Anisimov and El'sberg, *Problemy*, 305–6. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 183–4. E. Tager, "Vozniknovenie modernizma"; B. Mikhalovskii, "Simvolizm," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 189, 2: 246, 269. "Ot redaktsii"; V. Keldysh, L. Poliak, and L. Evstigneeva, "Sud'by kriticheskogo realizma," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 3: 5, 163–4, 172–3.

90. Zhirmunskii, *Drama*, 4, 9, 12–13, 22, 94. Cf. the Stalinist reading of the same play in B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, 228. For the tentative assimilation of Acmeism and Futurism to the Marxist philosophy of art, see Mustangova, "Poeticheskie traditsii," 1–2. Punin, "O forme," 1.

91. Iulii Aikhenval'd, "Realizm i naturalizm," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 2: 697–8. Briusov, "Neorealizm" (1922), *Sredi stikhov*, 611–12. Saianov, "Romantizm, realizm, naturalizm," 74–5.

92. Asmus, "Filosofiia," 30. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 405, 466, 769. For the Lukács-Bloch-Brecht controversy, see Bronner, *Modernism*, 23–25. Lunn, *Marxism*, 86–90.

93. Briusov, "Dialog o realizme v iskusstve" (1906), *Sredi stikhov*, 188–9. See also Tihanov, *Master*, 104.

94. Foster, *Heirs*, 3–4. See also Eysteinsson, *Concept*, 2–3.

95. Eliot, preface to *For Lancelot Andrewes*, ix–x; "Tradition and the Individual Talent," *Selected Essays*, 14. Pound, "Harold Monro," 590.

96. Briusov, "Sviashchennaia zhertva," 26. Rimbaud, "Lettres du 'voyant' [15 May 1871]," *Poésies*, 205. See also Compagnon, *Cinq paradoxes*, 17. Eliot, "Baudelaire," *Selected Essays*, 423–24. Hutchinson, *Modernism*, 102–3.

97. Cooper, *Modernism*, 30. Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity—an Incomplete Project," in Rabinow and Sullivan, *Interpretive Social Science*, 143. Krauss, *Originality*, 157. Levenson, *Modernism*, 48. M. Nad'iarnykh, "Avangard i problema traditsii," in Girin, *Avangard*, 1: 229–65.

98. Cottington, *Avant-Garde*, 9–14. Mojmir Grygar, "L'Avant-garde russe et l'avant-garde occidentale," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 2: 826–30. Makovskii, *Na Parnase*, 277. Stasov, "Nishchie dukhom" (1899); "Podvor'e prokazhennykh" (1899); "Dve dekadentskie vystavki" (1903), *Izbrannye sochineniia*, 3: 232–8, 257–63, 287–95.

99. Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic*, 20–8. See also Fokkema, *Literary History*, 8–11.

100. Poves and Kogan, *Modernisty*, 7–8.

101. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*, 3–11. Thibaudet, *Histoire*, 491. Veidle, "Bor'ba," 438–9.

102. Berghaus, *Theatre*, 35–45. Bürger, *Theory*, 49–50 and passim. Calinescu, *Five Faces*, 95–119. Poggioli, *Theory*, 75–7, 216–29. Russell, *Poets*, viii–ix, 7; "The Context of the Concept," in Garvin, *Romanticism*, 184.

103. Baudelaire, "Mon coeur mis à nu," *Œuvres*, 1: 690–1. Compagnon, *Cinq paradoxes*, 49–53. Cottington, *Avant-Garde*, 5–6. Egbert, *Social Radicalism*, 121–3. See also Jost Hermand, "Avant-Garde, Modern, Postmodern," in Hoesterey, *Zeitgeist*, 192–3.

104. Stasov, "Khorosha li rozn' mezhdu khudozhnikami?," *Izbrannye sochineniia*, 3: 166.

105. Williams, *Politics*, 32–3.

106. Nemoianu, *Taming*, 22.

107. For a recent example, see Kern, *Modernist Novel*, 2–3.

108. David Bradshaw, "Bootmakers and Watchmakers," in Castle, *History*, 139–40. Tyrus Miller, *Late Modernism*, 14–15. Jane Miller, *Rebel Women*, 8–9. Thompson, *Fiction*, 14–36.

109. Bathrick and Huyssen, "Modernism and the Experience of Modernity," in Huyssen and Bathrick, *Modernity*, 3.

110. Scholes and Wulfman, *Modernism*, 32–6. Thompson, *Fiction*, 14–36.

111. Clement Greenberg, "Beginnings of Modernism," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 21–3. René Wellek, "Russian Formalism," in Gibian and Tjalsma, *Russian Modernism*, 32–3.

112. Karen Rosenberg, "The Concept of Originality in Formalist Theory," in Jackson and Rudy, *Russian Formalism*, 162–5, 170. Peter Steiner, *Russian Formalism*, 58–9. Tihanov, "Why Did Modern Literary Theory," 80–1. Veidle, "Bor'ba," 439. Wellek, "Russian Formalism," 47.

113. Cohen, *Imagining*, 42–4. Boris Khazanov, "L'Année 1913"; Rainer Grübel, "Le Constructivisme," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 1: 430, 2: 742. See also Markov, "K voprosu o granitsakh dekadansa v russkoi poezii," 48, 54.

114. B. Gasparov, "Poetry of the Silver Age," 12–14. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 11–12. Keys, *Reluctant Modernist*, 11–12. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*, 1: 27–8, 107–8. Oraic, "Tsitatnost'," 118–30.

115. Compagnon, *Cinq paradoxes*, 84. Cottington, *Avant-Garde*, 110–12. Eysteinsson, *Concept*, 143–78. Bathrick and Huyssen, "Modernism and the Experience of Modernity," 8. Jensen, *Marketing*, 10–11. Joyeux-Prunel, *Avant-gardes*, 36–9. Levenson, *Modernism*, 23–50. Anthony Pym, "The Meaning of 'Life' in European Aesthetics at the End of the Nineteenth Century," in Berg, Durieux, and Lernout, *Turn of the Century*, 359–60. Rainey, *Institutions*, 99.

116. See Ioffe and White, *Russian Avant-Garde*, 11–18 and passim. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*, 1: 4–5 and passim.

117. Catriona Kelly, introduction to *Utopias*, xxii–xxvi. For a critique of these premises, see Eshelman, *Nikolaj Gumilev*, 10–13.

118. Belyi, "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo," 38. Briusov, "Poeziia Vladimira Solv'eva" (1900); "Interv'iu" (1900), *Sredi stikhov*, 58–9.

119. Briusov, "Modernisty, ikh predshestvenniki i kriticheskaia literatura o nikh" (1908), *Sredi stikhov*, 266. Poves and Kogan, *Modernisty*, 7–8.

120. Bogomolov, "Liubov'—odna. O poezii Zinaidy Gippius," *Russkaia literatura*, 31. Cassedy, *Flight*, 56. Dolgopolov, *Andrei Belyi*, 8. Fëdor Dviniatin, "Nabokov, modernizm, postmodernizm i mimesis," in Leving and Soshkin, *Imperiia N*, 442–4. B. Gasparov, "Poetry of the Silver Age," 5. M. Gasparov, "Antinomichnost' poetiki russkogo modernizma," 263; "Poetika 'serebrianogo veka,'" in Gasparov and Koretskaia, *Russkaia poeziia*, 29–30. Markov, "Mysli," 176; *Russian Futurism*, 2, 12–13, 40. Mickiewicz, "Problem," 7–9. Zhirmunskii, "Zadachi poetiki" (1919–23), *Teoriia*, 15–16; *Valerii Briusov*, 91–2.

121. Adamovich, "Kommentarii" (1923), 62. Adrianov, "Kriticheskie nabroski," 386. Apostolov, *Impressionizm*, 4–5. Belyi, "Emblematika smysla" (1909), *Simvolizm*, 49. Berdiaev, "Kul'tura," 326–7. Briusov, "K. D. Bal'mont. Budem kak solntse!" (1903); "Viacheslav Ivanov. Kormchie zvezdy" (1903); "N. Minskii" (1908), *Dalekie*, 46, 79–80, 116–18. Ellis, "O sovremennom simvolizme," 75–6. Gofshtetter, *Poeziia*, 10. A. Gornfel'd, "Fëdor Sologub," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 14. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 13. Rozanov, *Dekadenty*, 3–4. Tynianov, "Valerii Briusov" (1924), *Arkhaisty*, 525–6, 540. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 317–18.

122. M. Gasparov, "Poetika 'serebrianogo veka,'" 13–16.

123. Annenskii, "O sovremennom lirizme," 20. Berdiaev, "Kul'tura," 327. Eikhenbaum, "O kamernoi deklamatsii" (1923), *O poezii*, 512–21. Ivanov-Razumnik in Aleksandr Blok, "Perepiska s R. V. Ivanovym-Razumnikom," 367, 386. Veidle, "Mir Iskusstva," 25–6.

124. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm," 402.

125. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Buria i natisk" (1923), *Sochineniia*, 2: 288.

126. Kornei Chukovskii, *Futuristy*, 46. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Predislovie," *Sovremennaia literatura*, 3. Jangfeldt, *Iakobson*, 22. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 80. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Literaturnaia Moskva" (1922); "Buria i natisk" (1923), *Sochineniia*, 2: 275, 286. Jean Salot [Erenburg], "Russkaia poeziia," 8–9. Shapirshtein-Lers, *Obshchestvennyi smysl*, 34, 52, 55. See also Mikhail Gasparov, "Benedikt Livshits," in Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 6–7. Hans Günther, "O roli kul'turnoi pamiati v preddverii budushchego—akmeizm i futurism," in Esaulov, *Postsimvolizm*, 1: 18. A. Kofman, "Primitivistskaia sostavliaiushchaia avangardizma," in Girin, *Avangard*, 1: 157–228. Tihanov, "Politics," 680–1. Ronald Vroon, "Arkhaizm i futurizm," in Jaccard and Morard, *1913*, 113–30.

127. Khodasevich, "Letuchie listy," 3–4. "Ot redaktsii," *Chet i nechet*, 5. Terapiano, "Okol'nye puti," 34–5; "Zhurnal," 26. See also Livak, "Geroicheskie vremena molodoi zarubezhnoi poezii," in Livak and Ustinov, *Literaturnyi avangard*, 101–13. Terapiano, *Literaturnaia zhizn'*, 224.

128. Perloff, *Futurist Moment*, 165.

129. Belyi, "Poet mramora i bronzy" (1907), *Arabeski*, 452. Ellis, "O sovremennom simvolizme," 75–6.

130. Osip Mandel'shtam, "A. Blok" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 190.

131. Abramovich, "O futurizme v literature," 106. Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 377. Chudovskii, "Futurizm," 25–6, 29. Eikhenbaum, "Problemy poetiki Pushkina" (1921); "Anna Akhmatova" (1923), *O poezii*, 25, 81–5. Gumilev, "Nasledie," 42–3. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Slovo i kul'tura" (1921); "O prirode slova" (1922); "A. Blok" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 172, 176–7, 185–7, 190. "Pchely i osy Apollona. Skuchnyi razgovor," 83–4. Zhirmunskii, "Vokrug 'Poetiki' Opoiaza" (1919); "Dva napravleniia sovremennoi liriki" (1920), *Poetika*, 84–5, 405–11; "Na putiakh k klassitsizmu" (1921), *Teoriia*, 140–1; *Valerii Briusov*, 8, 50, 88, 91–3.

132. Bürger, *Theory*, 59–61.

133. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm" (1916); "Dva napravleniia sovremennoi liriki" (1920), *Poetika*, 404–6, 410–11; "Melodika stikha" (1922); "K voprosu o 'formal'nom metode'" (1923), *Teoriia*, 57, 91–2, 103; *Valerii Briusov*, 86, 91–3, 102. For an opposite opinion, see Eikhenbaum, "Anna Akhmatova" (1923), *O poezii*, 81–5, 107.

134. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*, 3–5, 11, 31, 61. See also Erenburg, "Novaia proza," 2.

135. Shklovskii, *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*, 235–6, 241–2. Zhirmunskii, "Poetika Aleksandra Bloka" (1921), *Teoriia*, 216, 232, 236–7. See also Tihanov, "Politics," 669–74.

136. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 74–5, 104. Pasternak, *Okhrannaia gramota* (1931), *Vozdushnye puti*, 256. See also Lavrov, "Andrei Belyi i Boris Pasternak," *Andrei Belyi*, 309–10.

137. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (2 March 1925), 2; (7 September 1925), 2. Belyi, "Literatura i krizis zhizni" (1925), in N. Bogomolov, "Ob Andree Belom," *Russkaia literatura*, 476. Bëm, "O bezotvetstvennosti v poezii" (1931), *Pis'ma*, 47. Lisitskii and Erenburg, editorial, 1–2. Zamiatin, "Genealogicheskoe derevo Uellsa" (1921–22), *My*, 603. See also Nabokov (24 August 1942), *Nabokov-Wilson Letters*, 72.

138. Poplavskii, "Vokrug 'Chisel,'" 204–5. Terapiano, "Okol'nye puti," 34–5; "Zhurnal," 26. See also Fedotov, "Chetverodnevnyi Lazar'," 142–3.

139. Khodasevich, "Literatura v izgnanii," *Literaturnye stat'i*, 262.

140. See Slobin, "Modernism/Modernity," 59; *Russians Abroad*, 31.

141. Mints, "Ob evoliutsii russkogo simvolizma," *Poetika*, 186.

142. Zamiatin, "O literature, revoliutsii i entropii," *Litsa*, 249–56.

143. Khodasevich, "Konets Renaty," *Koleblemyi trenozhnik*, 269–78. See also Bogomolov, "Prose between Symbolism and Realism," 30–1.

144. Belyi, "Ognennyi angel" (1909), *Arabeski*, 454–6. Kuzmin, "Khudozhestvennaia proza," 39–40.

145. Eikhenbaum, "O proze Kuzmina" (1920), *O literature*, 348–51.

146. Adamovich, "Ob M. Kuzmine," 2. Vorovskii, "O burzhuaznosti modernistov," 201. Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm," 366–8. See also John Malmstad, "Bani, prostituty i seks-klub. Vospriiatie 'Kryl'ev' M. Kuzmina," in Pavlova, *Erotizm*, 122–3. Markov, "Beseda o proze Kuzmina," *O svobode*, 166. Medaric, "Modern," 57–77.

147. Remizov, "Poslushnyi samokei," *Izbrannoe*, 579–82.

148. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 158.

149. See Gurianova, *Aesthetics*, 80–1. John Malmstad, "Back to the Future: The World of Art and the World of *Ballets russes*," in Rizzi and Veroli, *Omaggio*, 20. Vroon, "Arkhaizm i futurizm," 113–30. See also Baïdine, *Archaïsme*, passim.

150. Russell, "Modernist Tradition," 223–34.

151. See Fadeev, *Razgrom*, 23, 32–5. Furmanov, *Chapaev*, 4, 12, 168. Gladkov, *Tsement*, 6, 9, 17. Serafimovich, *Zheleznyi potok*, *Sobranie*, 6: 463–4. For contemporary critical commentary on the "modernist veneer" of Serafimovich's and Gladkov's novels, see Lezhnev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 110. See also Zamiatin, "O segodniashnem i sovremennom," *Litsa*, 215.

152. Bulgakov, *Belaia gvardiia*, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia*, 1: 140–2.

153. Tsetlin, "Mikh. Bulgakov," 529–30. See also Zamiatin, "O segodniashnem i sovremennom," 217.

154. Bulgakov and Bulgakova, *Dnevnik*, 29, 56, 58. Bulgakova, *Dnevnik*, 51–2.

155. Chudakova, "Sotsial'naia praktika, filologicheskaia refleksiia i literatura v nauchnoi biografii Eikhenbauma i Tynianova," *Literatura*, 433–54.

156. Andrew Wachtel, "Zamechaniia o vzaimootnoshenii khudozhestvennykh i nauchnykh proizvedenii Tynianova," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 222–30.

157. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (6 February 1927), 2. Bëm, "Iurii Tynianov," 461–2. Ginzburg, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 383. Knipovich, "O romanakh," 86.

158. V. Eidinova, "Tynianovskie poniatiia 'smeshcheniia' i 'smeny' i nekotorye iavleniia russkoi prozy 1920-kh godov," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 236–8.

159. Jauss, *Toward an Aesthetic*, 20–8. See also Fokkema, *Literary History*, 8–11.

160. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*, 3–5. Erenburg, "Novaia proza," 2.

161. Adamovich, "Pamiati Andreia Belogo," 57. Fel'zen, "My v Evrope" (1936), *Sobranie*, 2: 242. Loks, "Sovremennaia proza" 5: 84. O. Mandel'shtam, "Andrei Belyi," 399–400.

162. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura ot semidesiatykh godov*, 378–9, 382; *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 32–4. Riding and Graves, *Survey*, 9, 102–3, 155–8, 176.

163. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 202.

164. Stone, "Aleksandr Blok," 638.

165. Viktor Khovin, "Modernizirovannyi Adam," 9.

166. Voronskii, "O pisatele i chitatele" (1922), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 112–13.

167. Maguire, *Red Virgin Soil*, 17.

168. Bëm, "Soblazn prostoty" (1934), *Issledovaniia*, 396–9. Gomolitskii, "Mif prostoty," *Arion* (1939), *Sochineniia*, 3: 663–9.

169. Mikhail Gasparov, "Stikh nachala XX v.," in Keldysh, *Sviaz'*, 375.

170. Perry Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," in Nelson and Grossberg, *Marxism*, 325. Carey, *Intellectual*, 1–17. Pippin, *Modernism*, 32.

171. Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, vii–viii.

172. Clement Greenberg, "The Notion of 'Postmodern,'" in Hoesterey, *Zeitgeist*, 46–8.

173. Belyi, "Avtobiograficheskaia spravka," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 3: 12.

174. Aleksandr Blok, "Voprosy," 66.

175. Coyle, *Ezra Pound*, 121–47. Dettmar and Watt, introduction to *Marketing*, 5–6. Hipsky, *Modernism*, xvi, 217–20. Kern, *Modernist Novel*, 7. Michael Murphy, "One Hundred Per Cent Bohemia," in Dettmar and Watt, *Marketing*, 64–6. Scholes, *Paradoxy*, 4–32. Thompson, *Fiction*, 5.

176. Chudovskii, "Zametki," 54. Gurevich, "Literatura nashego vremeni," 102. P. Kogan, "Chto zhdet nashu literaturu," in *Kuda my idem?*, 87. Tasteven, *Futurizm*, 17.

177. Belyi, "M. Kuzmin," 50–1. Ellis, "Esche odna korona," 63; "Krizis," 63–5. Ginzburg, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 125. Mirskii, "Veianie smerti v predrevoliutsionnoi literature," *Uncollected Writings*, 233.

178. Serge Rolet, "L'Âge d'argent et ses repoussoirs"; Nikolai Bogomolov, "Serebrianyi vek," in Lanne, *Âge*, 45–51, 135–7.

179. Jürgen Habermas, "Modernity—an Incomplete Project," in Rabinow and Sullivan, *Interpretive Social Science*, 143.

180. Perl, *Tradition*, 14, 68, 76–7, 87–9.

181. Howe, *Idea*, 22.

Chapter 3. Russian Modernism in Time and Space

1. Kelly, "Iconoclasm and Commemorating the Past," in Kelly and Shepherd, *Constructing*, 230. Rylkova, *Archaeology*, 8, 41–2.

2. Kogan, "Russkaia literatura," 233, 240–1.

3. Finkel, "Purging the Public Intellectual," 592–611. Trotsky advocated the expulsion of modernist artists and intellectuals ("Diktatura," 1).

4. Trotskii, "Vneoktiabr'skaia literatura," *Literatura*, 30–8, 49. Voronskii, "I. Babel'" (1924), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 276, 284–5.

5. Ashukin, "Sovremennost'," 4–6. Lelevich, "Snova," 70–1. Lezhnev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 82. Saianov, "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," *Ot klassikov*, 91–2.

6. Briusov, "Sredi stikhov," *Sredi stikhov*, 558; "Vchera," 49–68.

7. Z. Gippius, "Literaturnaia zapis'," 236–9. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Predislovie," *Sovremennaia literatura*, 4. Krandievskaia and Mirtov, "Dva pis'ma," 298–9. Mochul'skii, "Novaia proza," 1–2. Muratov, "Iskusstvo," 244–5. Stepun, "Porevoliutsionnoe soznanie," 17–18. Vermel', "Poeziia," 33.

8. Karl Radek, "Sovremennaia mirovaia literatura i zadachi proletarskogo iskusstva," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s"ezd*, 291. Levin, "Vyzhech'," 2.

9. B. Mikhailovskii, *Russkaia literatura*, passim. Selivanovskii, *Ocherki*, 14, 45–6.

10. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 786.

11. Bialik, "Vvedenie," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 5–7, 11. M. Kuznetsov, "Sotsialisticheskii realism v sootnoshenii s drugimi tvorcheskimi metodami," in Samarin, Khrapchenko, and El'sberg, *Realizm*, 303–25.

12. See the editorial in *Stikhotvorenie. Poeziia i poeticheskaia kritika*, 1: 2. Sosinskii, "Fëdor Sologub," 11.

13. Mathewson, "Russian Literature," 416–17. McLean, "Development," 405.

14. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 2–3.

15. Donald Fanger, "The City of Russian Modernist Fiction," in Bradbury and McFarlane, *Modernism*, 468, 479. Gibian, introduction to Gibian and Tjalsma, *Russian Modernism*, 10, 15.

16. John Bowlt, "Modernism," in Terras, *Handbook of Russian Literature*, 286.

17. See introduction to Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 1: 8–9.

18. Evelyn Bristol, "Turn of a Century: Modernism, 1895–1925," in Moser, *Cambridge History*, 388, 449. Katerina Clark, *Petersburg*, ix. Clark and Dobrenko, *Soviet Culture*, 3–4. Katerina Clark, "The 'Quiet Revolution' in Soviet Intellectual Life," in Fitzpatrick, Rabinowitch, and Stites, *Russia*, 214–15. Cohen, *Imagining*, 4, 185.

19. See Mikhail Gasparov, "Poetika 'serebrianogo veka,'" in Gasparov and Koretskaia, *Russkaia poeziia*, 8. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 4–5. Paperno, introduction to Paperno and Grossman, *Creating Life*, 9–11.

20. Tjalsma, "Acmeism," 94, 97. Slobin, "Modernism/Modernity," passim; *Russians Abroad*, passim.

21. Boldt, Segal, and Fleishman, "Problemy," 161.

22. Slonim, "Zametki," 617–18.

23. Blium, *Za kulisami*, 199–200. Mirskii, "The Present State of Russian Letters" (1927), *Uncollected Writings*, 246.

24. Erenburg (15 April 1925), *Dai oglianut'sia*, 422–3. See also his letters to P. Kogan (5 December 1922); A. Voronskii (9 February 1923); E. Polonskaia (19 May 1923); M. Shkapskaia (22 May 1923); V. Lidin (December 1926), *Dai oglianut'sia*, 226–7, 255, 281–2, 522.

25. Voronskii, "Sovetskaia literatura i belaia emigratsiia" (1925), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 355–63. See also Gorbov, "10 let," 23–4. Radlov, "Veshch'," *O futurizme*, 56.

26. On *Russkii sovremennik*, see Kornei Chukovskii (17 April 1924; 29 January 1926), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 271, 365. Khodasevich, "Gor'kii" (1938), *Nekropol'*, 206. On *Sovremennaia literatura*, see Lavrov, *Russkie simvolisty*, 576.

27. Glavatskii, *"Filosofskii parokhod,"* 184. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 116.

28. Meshcheriakov, "Nashi," 275, 281. Voronskii, "Iz sovremennykh literaturnykh nastroenii" (1922), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 117–20.

29. Gorbov, "10 let," 23–4. Voronskii, "Iskusstvo, kak poznanie zhizni," 371–2; "Sovetskaia literatura i belaia emigratsiia," 353–4.

30. Terapiano, "Zhurnal," 23. See also Iashchenko, "Literatura," 1–2. Kuprin, "Moi geroi," 66–7. Osorgin, "Rossiiskie pisateli," 375; "Rossiiskie zhurnaly," 432–3; "Vladimir Maiakovskii," 456. Slonim, "Literatura," 182–4.

31. Mirskii, "Konst. Fedin," 432; "O nyneshnem sostoianii," 90, 94.

32. Z. Gippius, "Zelenaia lampa," 36. Fondaminskii, "Zelenaia lampa," 46. For the term *podsovetskii*, see Bëm, "O kritike i kritikakh" (1931), *Pis'ma*, 33; "O sovetskoi literature" (1933), *Issledovaniia*, 385. Gomolitskii, "O literaturakh" (1936); "50 let russkoi literatury" (1939), *Sochineniia*, 3: 430, 633.

33. Balashov, "Iubileinoe izdanie," 5–14.

34. Adamovich, "Literatura v SSSR," 180. "Protiv burzhuaznykh tribunov," 1. "Protiv pereklichki s emigrantshchinoi," 2. Volin, "Plody," 1. See also Blium, *Za kulisami*, 200, 222, 229–30. Papernyi, *Kul'tura*, 77–8. Seifrid, "Getting Across," 246.

35. Von Hagen, "Toward a Cultural and Intellectual History," 299–300.

36. N. Smirnov, "Solntse," 250–67. See also Kazmin, "Emigrantskie gazety," 71–2.

37. Gorbov, "10 let," 9–35; "Mertvaia krasota i zhivuchee bezobrazie" (1926), *U nas*, 7–27. Karzhanskii, "Zarubezhnaia Rossiia," 282–93. Lezhnev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 82. Saianov, "Kratkie svedeniia ob emigrantskoi literature," *Sovremennye literaturnye gruppirovki*, 126–32. Samartsev, "Po tu storonu," 111–19. N. Smirnov, "Na tom beregu," 141–50. Volin, "Emigrantskaia poeziia," 20–3. See also S. Boiko, "Russkoe zarubezh'e i 'Pereval,'" in Beliakova, *"V rasseianii sushchie,"* 236–7. Goriainov, "Vozdeistvie," 428–30.

38. Kovarskii, "Spor," 114. Radek, "Kul'tura," 2. "Rech' S. G. Petrova," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s''ezd*, 608–11.

39. Mikh., "My stroim," 2. See also Erenburg, "Paragviana," 3. Khokhlov, "Da byl li mal'chik?," 2. Zelinskii, "Rubaki," 10.

40. Gomolitskii, "Kontrabanda" (1936), *Sochineniia*, 3: 396–7. See also Erenburg to V. Lidin (17 and 23 June 1925; 27 October and 11 November 1926), *Dai oglianut'sia*, 438–9, 511, 515. Olesha (12 April 1956), *Kniga*, 303–5.

41. Johnson, "Chistaia propaganda," 3. Nikulin, "Razgovor," 8. *Protiv burzhuaznogo liberalizma*, 104.

42. Forsh, *Simvolisty*, *Letoshnii sneg*, 226–50, 353–4.

43. Berberova, "Zelenaia lampa," 43. Knut, "Zelenaia lampa," 42.

44. Slonim, "Literaturnyi dnevnik," 63–4; "Zametki," 616–18. Tsetlin, "Literaturnye zametki," 514–18.

45. Terapiano, "Na Balkanakh," 140.

46. Adamovich, "Vadim Andreev," 521–2. Gomolitskii, "O literaturakh" (1936), *Sochineniia*, 3: 428–30. Khodasevich, "O zadachakh," 3. Stepun, "Porevoliutsionnoe soznanie," 12–28.

47. Bëm, "O kritike i kritikakh" (1931), *Pis'ma*, 33–4. See also Bëm, "Znamenatel'nyi povorot" (1933), *Pis'ma*, 158; "O sovetskoi literature" (1933); "O s''ezde sovetskikh pisatelei" (1935), *Issledovaniia*, 394, 407.

48. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (1 August 1926), 2. Khodasevich, "O formalizme," 2–3; "Letuchie listy," 3–4.

49. Adamovich, "Opravdaetsia li nadezhda?" (1928), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 29–32.

50. Adamovich, "Vadim Andreev," 521–2; "O literature v emigratsii" (1931), 2.

51. Adamovich, "Pamiati sovetskoi literatury," 206–8; "O polozhenii," 296–300. See also his "Sud'by sovetskoi literatury" (1930); "Chelovek v sovetskoi literature" (1931); "Mysli i somneniia" (1932); "Tri p'esy" (1933); "Ne apologiia" (1933), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 385–90, 1: 543, 2: 11, 251, 330; "'Khudozhnik neizvesten' V. Kaverina" (1932), *Literaturnye zametki*, 2: 23–4.

52. Adamovich, "Nesostoiavshaiasia progulka," 289–95. See also his "Literaturnye vpechatleniia," 207–8.

53. Ivanov-Razumnik, "'Proletarskaia literatura' i 'sotsialisticheskii realizm'" (1943), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 359–60. See also Aleksandr Blok, "Krushenie gumanizma" (1919), *Sobranie*, 6: 111. Slonim, "Molodye pisateli," 116–18. For the catacombs metaphor, see Ivanov-Razumnik to Belyi (November 1924), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 770–3.

54. "Politika i iskusstvo. Vecher 'Chisel,'" 261. Sharshun, "Magicheskii realism," 230–1.

55. Adamovich, "O literature v emigratsii" (1932), 335–9; "Neznakomka," 16–17. See also his "Ne apologiia" (1933); "Plan" (1933); "Na raznye temy" (1933), *Literaturnye zametki*, 2: 324–8, 367–73, 385. Bëm, "O sovetskoi literature," 383–93. On the first cohort of properly Soviet writers, see Katerina Clark, "'Quiet Revolution' in Soviet Intellectual Life," 225–6. Dobrenko, *Formovka*, 9–10, 479. Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 212–13.

56. A. Bëm (19 April and 6 May 1942); G. Ivanov (26 May 1942); Ivanov-Razumnik (27 May 1942; 5 June 1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 31, 91, 125, 165, 170. Iurii Ivask, "Tret'ia beseda s G. V. Adamovichem," in Bogomolov, "Proekt 'Akmeizm,'" 149–50. See also N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 289–90. Iu. Oksman to G. Struve (21 December 1962), in Fleishman, "Iz arkhiva," 34–5.

57. Marietta Chudakova, "Osvedomiteli v dome Bulgakova v seredine 1930-kh

godov," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 441–42. Goriainov, "Vozdeistvie," 427–30.

58. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki"; "Mandel'shtam, Pasternak i chitatel' 1920-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 133, 504.

59. Kornei Chukovskii (3 December 1944), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 168.

60. Kornei Chukovskii (26 March 1922), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 202; *Chukokkala*, 121, 238. Chukovskaia, *Zapiski*, 1: 154. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 488. Luknitskii, *Vstrechi*, 251–2. Ronen, *Serebrianyi vek*, 84–5.

61. McLean, "Reply," 430. Gleb Struve, "Aesthetic Function," 425–7.

62. Fanger, "City of Russian Modernist Fiction," 468–79.

63. Bowlt, "Modernism," 284–6. For another example, see M. Gasparov, "Poetika 'serebrianogo veka,'" 15–16.

64. See introduction and "La Culture russe et l'émigration," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 2: 8, 61–212.

65. Terras, *History*, 522–5; "The Era of Socialist Realism, 1925–53," in Moser, *Cambridge History*, 458–519.

66. Bethea, "Literature," in Rzhevsky, *Cambridge Companion*, 189–90.

67. Kelly, introduction to *Utopias*, xxi–xxvi.

68. Galin Tihanov, "Russian Émigré Literary Criticism and Theory between the World Wars," in Dobrenko and Tihanov, *History*, 145.

69. Dobrenko and Balina, *Cambridge Companion*, xxi.

70. Harsha Ram, "Russia," in Lewis, *Cambridge Companion*, 114–16.

71. Josipovici, *What Ever Happened*, 187.

72. Armstrong, *Modernism*, 24. On the tripartite historical schema of transnational modernism, see Irving Howe, "The Culture of Modernism," *Decline*, 5. Rabaté, *1913*, 3.

73. Adamovich, *Kommentarii*, 495.

74. Donchin, *Influence*, 8–31, 49–75. Polonsky, *English Literature*, 29–30. Pyman, *History of Russian Symbolism*, 170–2. The first seven issues of *Zolotoe runo* (1906) even provided parallel French texts for all Russian prose. See "Ot redaktsii," *Zolotoe runo* 11–12 (1909), 105.

75. Adamovich, "O frantsuzskoi 'inquiétude' i o russkoi trevoge" (1928), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 108–11. Tsetlin, "Emigrantskoe," 439–41. Veidle, "O frantsuzskoi literature," 496–502.

76. Adamovich, "Zhizn'," 2; "O literature v emigratsii" (1932), 335–6, 339; "Nesostoiavshaiasia progulka," 289–96. Fel'zen, "My v Evrope" (1936), *Sobranie*, 2: 237–42. Poplavskii, "Vokrug 'Chisel,'" 204–5. Sharshun, "Magicheskii realism," 230–1. Slonim, "Zametki," 619–26. Varshavskii, "Neskol'ko rassuzhdenii," 221.

77. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (31 January 1926), 1–2; "O literature v emigratsii" (1932), 339; "Litsa i knigi," 324–5, 329. G. Ivanov to Ivanov-Razumnik (26 May 1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 31.

78. For polemics with *Chisla*, see Bëm, "Vne zhizni" (1936); "Poeziia L. Chervinskoi" (1938), *Pis'ma*, 267–68, 318. Khodasevich, "Chisla," 3.

79. Ivanov and Gershenzon, *Perepiska*, 42–3.

80. Verlaine, "Art poétique," *Oeuvres*, 327.

81. Merezhkovskii, "L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii" (1900–2), *L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii*, 350.

82. Belyi, "Teatr i sovremennaia drama" (1907), *Arabeski*, 17–36.

83. Rozanov, "Opavshie list'ia. Korob vtoroi" (1915), *Mysli*, 333–4. See also D. Burliuk et al., "Poshchechina obshchestvennomu vkusu" (1912); "Sadok sudei" (2, 1913), in Markov, *Manifesty*, 51–2.

84. In his 1927 "documentary" novel *Russia in the Whirlwind*, Remizov acknowledged his debt to Rozanov (*Vzvikhrennaia Rus'*, 39, 90). On the emergent documentary turn in the 1910s, see Bogomolov, "Dnevniki v russkoi kul'ture nachala XX veka," *Russkaia literatura*, 202–9.

85. Briusov, "Stikhi 1911 goda" (1911), *Dalekie*, 199–20.

86. Eikhenbaum, "Roman ili biografiia" (1913); *Molodoi Tolstoi* (1922); "Leskov i sovremennaia proza" (1925), *O literature*, 36, 288–9, 412–13. Tynianov, "Literaturnyi fakt" (1924), *Arkhaisty*, 23–9; "O literaturnoi evoliutsii" (1927), *Poetika*, 270–3. Shklovskii, *Rozanov*, 16–39; *Tret'ia fabrika* (1926), *Gamburgskii schet*, 86.

87. See Mochul'skii, "Krizis," 76–81. Veidle, "Chelovek," 139–45. Vinaver, "Ugolovnyi roman," 257–8.

88. Arland, "Sur un nouveau mal du siècle" (1924), *Essais*, 11–37. Valéry, "La Crise de l'esprit," *Oeuvres*, 1: 992–1000. See also Rivière, "Crise du concepte de littérature," 159–60. Leiris, *Âge d'homme*, 10.

89. Berge, *Esprit*, 17–19. Léonard, *Crise*, 66–67. For critical attitudes toward Gide, see *Studio franco-russe*, 202–16.

90. Adamovich, "Otsenki," 2.

91. For Zoshchenko's critical reflection, see his *Vozvrashchennaia molodost'* and *Pered voskhodom solntsa*, *Sobranie*, 5: 9–10, 245.

92. Olesha (13 April and 5 May 1930; 24 July 1931; undated for 1930–31), *Kniga*, 33–7, 109–10.

93. Kornei Chukovskii (22 October 1967; 17 September 1968), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 397, 455. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki. 1943"; "Zapisi 1950–1960-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 174, 214, 230–1, 261. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vtoraia kniga*, 32. O. Mandel'shtam, "Slovo i kul'tura" (1921); "Gumanizm i sovremennost'" (1923), *Sochineniia*, 2: 201, 206–7.

94. Shklovskii, *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*, 200–1. Ivanov-Razumnik to Belyi (November 1924), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 770–3. See also A. Galushkin, "K 'dopechatnoi' istorii romana E. I. Zamiatina 'My,'" in Polivanov, Shevelenko, and Ustinov, *Themes*, 327.

95. Adamovich, "Otsenki," 2. Fedotov, "O smerti," 143–7. Osip Mandel'shtam, "O prirode slova," *Sochineniia*, 2: 187. Otsup, "O poezii," 134–5.

96. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (16 January 1927), 1–2; "Stikhi" (1932), *Literaturnye zametki*, 2: 110–16. Otsup, "Serebrianyi vek," 175–6; "Iz dnevnika," 200–1. Poplavskii, "O misticheskoi atmosfere," 308–11; "O smerti," 3.

97. See Veniamin Kaverin's entry in *Kak my pishem*, 61–2.

98. Adamovich, "O frantsuzskoi 'inquiétude,'" 2; "Sovremennye zapiski," 2; "Parizhskie vpechatleniia," 2; "Eshche o 'zdes','" 3; "Pis'ma o Lermontove," 2. N. Dashkov [Veidle], "Iz evropeiskoi literatury," 4. Fedotov, "Rossiia," 4. Fel'zen, "My v Evrope," 237–42. Gorodetskaia, "Spor," 5. D. Leis [Veidle], "Bolezn'," 5–6. Raevskii, "O russkoi trevoge," 4. Reznikov, "Chto budet," 4.

99. Adamovich, "Nachalo," 504; "Na raznye temy," 3. Arland, "Sur un nouveau mal du siècle," 18. Fel'zen, "Sergei Sharshun. Put' pravyi" (1934), *Sobranie*, 2: 293–5. Ianovskii, *Polia*, 36, 247, 277. Kel'berin, "L. F. Céline," 223–4. Iu. Mandel'shtam, "Dnevnik," 4; "Smert'," 5. Poplavskii, "Zametki," 28–9. Veidle, "Chelovek," 139–45.

100. See Bëm, "Ispoved' 'geroia nashego vremeni'" (1935), *Pis'ma*, 219–22. "Iskusstvo i politika," 3. "Politika i iskusstvo. Vecher 'Chisel,'" 259–61. See also Livak, "Nina Berberova," 463–78; *How It Was Done*, 34–8.

101. John Malmstad, "Vospominaniia 'fanatika i skeptika.' Ellis ob Andree Belom," in Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 401.

102. Fedotov, "O smerti," 144–7.

103. Adamovich, "O literature v emigratsii" (1932), 336–7, 339.

104. Adamovich, "Nesostoiavshaiasia progulka," 290–6. Fedotov, "Sozdanie," 389–407. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 320–2. For a parallel trend in Soviet Russia, see Zamiatin, "Genealogicheskoe derevo Uellsa" (1921–22), *My*, 603.

105. Bitsilli, "Formula," 397–9; "Wladimir Weidlé," 471–2. This argument informs Vladimir Veidle's books of cultural criticism, *Les Abeilles d'Aristée* (1936) and *Umiranie iskusstva* (1937).

106. Adamovich, "Na polustankakh," 2. See also Osip Mandel'shtam, "Slovo i kul'tura" (1921), *Sochineniia*, 2: 169–72. Tynianov, "Promezhutok" (1924), *Poetika*, 168–9. Zhirmunskii, "Dva napravleniia sovremennoi liriki" (1920), *Poetika*, 405–11.

107. Otsup, "Serebrianyi vek," 175–6.

108. Adamovich, "O Bunine," 2; "Literaturnye besedy" (29 December 1924), 2; (27 July 1925), 2; "Mysli i somneniia" (1932), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 45–7. Fedotov, "O smerti," 146. Mochul'skii, "Klassitsizm," 376–7.

109. Terapiano, "Iu. Fel'zen," 267–8. See also Poplavskii, "Vokrug 'Chisel,'" 204–5. Terapiano, "Okol'nye puti," 34–5; "Zhurnal," 26. Fedotov, "Chetverodnevnyi Lazar'," 142–3.

110. Perl, *Tradition*, 12–14, 68–89.

111. Livak, "Geroicheskie vremena molodoi zarubezhnoi poezii," in Livak and Ustinov, *Literaturnyi avangard*, 101–13.

112. Terapiano, *Vstrechi*, 150–1.

113. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (7 September 1925), 2; "O prostote i

'vyvertakh'" (1928); "Na raznye temy" (1933), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 74–8, 2: 302–3. Muratov, "Iskusstvo," 244–6.

114. Riding and Graves, *Survey*, 270.

115. Bëm, "O dvukh napravleniiakh v sovremennoi poezii" (1934); "O stikhakh Emilii Chegrintsevoi" (1936), *Pis'ma*, 198, 248. Gomolitskii, "Skit poetov" (1937), *Sochineniia*, 3: 476.

116. Bëm, "V tupike" (1936); "Vne zhizni" (1936), *Pis'ma*, 256, 266–8.

117. Markov, "Mysli," 175–80. See also Kelly, introduction to *Utopias*, xxi–xxii. Tjalsma, "Acmeism," 94, 97. Iu. Ivask wrote to V. Veidle (18 January 1965): "Best émigré poets had retained the good Acmeist manners circa 1913." Collection Weidle, Box 2, Folder "Ivask, Iurii Pavlovich. 1965" (Bakhmeteff).

118. Iu. Terapiano to Iu. Ivask (17 December 1959), Iurii Ivask Papers, Series 1, Box 6, Folder 41 (Amherst).

119. Iu. Terapiano to A. Rannit (24 August 1962), Alexis Rannit Papers, Box 29, Folder "Iurii Terapiano" (Beinecke).

120. Iurii Ivask, "Tret'ia beseda s G. V. Adamovichem" (1960), in Bogomolov, "Proekt 'Akmeizm,'" 149.

121. For interpretations of Pasternak's career, see Michel Aucouturier, "L'Antimodernisme de Pasternak," in Lanne, *Fin*, 67–76. Zholkovskii, *Text*, 218–19.

122. Tyrus Miller, *Late Modernism*, 16–18.

123. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (16 May 1926), 3; "V. Ianovskii," 457. Terapiano, "Chelovek," 210–12.

124. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (6 June 1926), 2; "Pamiati Andreia Belogo," 57; "Literaturnye zametki" (1931), "'Maski' Andreia Belogo" (1933), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 477–8, 2: 234.

125. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (23 February 1925; 16 January 1927; 28 December 1925), 1–2. Terapiano, "Chelovek," 210–12.

126. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (29 December 1924; 21 November 1926; 6 February 1927), 2; "Posle Rossii," *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 45–8. Bëm, "Iurii Tynianov," 461–2. Ginzburg, "Zapisi, ne opublikovannye pri zhizni," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 383.

127. See Eikhenbaum, *Moi vremennik* (1929), *"Moi vremennik,"* 71, 137. Segal, "Literatura," 151–244. Shepherd, *Beyond Metafiction*, 22–6 and passim.

128. On Nabokov's utilization of Gide's novel, see Livak, *How It Was Done*, 164–203.

129. Bëm, "Chelovek i pisatel'" (1936), *Pis'ma*, 260; letter to Ivanov-Razumnik (6 May 1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 170. Bitsilli, "Zhizn'," 286; "Iv. Bunin," 222. Tsetlin, "V. Sirin. Korol', dama, valet," 537–8; "V. Sirin. Vozvrashchenie Chorba," 530–1. See also Al. Novik [Khokhlov], "V. Sirin. Zashchita Luzhina," 514–17. Osorgin, "V. Sirin. Kamera Obscura," 458–9.

130. Adamovich, "Sirin," 3; "'Sovremennye zapiski,' kniga XLIV" (1930); "'Sovremennye zapiski,' kniga 51-ia" (1933), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 407–8, 2: 210. Varshavskii, "V. Sirin. 'Podvig,'" 266–7.

131. Livak, *How It Was Done*, 125–34.

132. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Andrei Belyi," 399–400; "O prirode slova" (1922), "Literaturnaia Moskva" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 176–87, 275–7. See also Lekmanov, "Mandel'shtam i Maiakovskii," *Kniga*, 572.

133. Eshelman, *Early Soviet Postmodernism*, 24–6, 65–80. Lipovetskii, *Paralogii*, xxii–xxvii.

134. Anisimov, "O nasledstve," 1. Bëm, "Soblazn prostoty" (1934), *Issledovaniia*, 396–9. Gomolitskii, "Mif prostoty" (1939), *Sochineniia*, 3: 663–9. Iu. Ivask wrote to V. Veidle (18 January 1965): "I have been thinking about émigré poetry. Between us—isn't it too pretty? I mean the verse of Ivanov, Adamovich, and Chinnov. Same old melodious rhythms, refinement in expression, logic in narration! Adamovich kept writing about simplicity, even poverty, but his poetry is often rhetorical, and its tone is always lofty. Of course, it would be silly to bow to western experiments and hooliganism." Collection Weidle, Box 2, Folder "Ivask, Iurii Pavlovich. 1965. Letters to Weidle" (Bakhmeteff).

135. Howe, introduction to *Idea*, 19.

136. Cf. Loks, "Sovremennaia proza," 5: 83–4. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Andrei Belyi," 399–400. Nusinov, "Maski," 3.

137. For recent examples, see Evgenii Dobrenko, *Formovka sovetskogo pisatelia* (1999) and Elizabeth Papazian, *Manufacturing Truth* (2009). For earlier examples, see Katerina Clark, "Little Heroes and Big Deeds: Literature Responds to the First Five-Year Plan"; Sheila Fitzpatrick, "Cultural Revolution as Class War," in Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Revolution*, 31, 202–3.

138. See Irina Gutkin, "The Legacy of Symbolist Aesthetic Utopia," in Paperno and Grossman, *Creating Life*, 167–92.

139. Arvatov, "Literatura," 309–18. Chuzhak, "Pod znakom," 12, 22; "Ob etoi knige i ob nas," *Literatura fakta*, 5. "Lef i MAPP," 3. Maiakovskii and Brik, "Nasha slovesnaia rabota," 40–1. V. Pertsov, "Grafik," 15–17. Tret'iakov, "Prodolzhenie," 1–4.

140. F. Ivanov, "Fetishisty," 235. Khodasevich, "Literatura i vlast' v sovetskoi Rossii," *Nekropol'*, 248–9. Mustangov, "O 'levoi fraze,'" 326–7. Selivanovskii, *Ocherki*, 265–6.

141. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1925–26), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 32–3, 38. Hansen-Löve, *Russkii formalizm*, 484–8.

142. Khodasevich, "Novye stikhi," 3–4; "Zhalost'," 3–4. See also Livak, *How It Was Done*, 135–63.

143. Bowlt, "Modernism," 284–6. Bristol, "Turn of a Century," 387. D. Maksimov, "'Severnyi vestnik' i simvolisty," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 89. Peterson, *History*, xi, 13. Reitblat, "Izdatel'stva novogo tipa," in Frolova, *Kniga*, 232. D. Segal, "O vozmozhnoi tipologii 'serebrianykh vekov,'" in Lanne, *Âge*, 3. E. Tager, "Vozniknovenie modernizma," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 189.

144. David Bethea, "Literature," in Rzhevsky, *Cambridge Companion*, 178. Bristol,

"Turn of a Century"; Julian Connoly, "The Nineteenth Century: Between Realism and Modernism," in Moser, *Cambridge History*, 333, 387. Kling, "Evoliutsiia," 37.

145. Nikolai Bogomolov, "Serebrianyi vek," in Lanne, *Âge*, 138; "Prose between Symbolism and Realism," in Dobrenko and Balina, *Cambridge Companion*, 21, 26.

146. Peterson, *History*, 42 and passim. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 1–3.

147. Erlich, *Modernism*, 1–2. Efim Etkind, "Edinstvo 'serebrianogo veka,'" in Etkind et al., *Letteratura*, 15. Fanger, "City of Russian Modernist Fiction," 468. Fink, *Bergson*, xiv. Ioffe, introduction to Ioffe and White, *Russian Avant-Garde*, 14. Paperno, introduction to Paperno and Grossman, *Creating Life*, 3. Peterson, *History*, 1. Wachtel and Vinitsky, *Russian Literature*, 157.

148. Perry Anderson, "Postscript to 'Marshall Berman: Modernity and Revolution,'" *Zone*, 53. Foster, *Heirs*, 3–4. Clement Greenberg, "To Cope with Decadence," in Buchloh, Guilbaut, and Solkin, *Modernism*, 164. Hutchinson, *Modernism*, 101–2. Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, 44. Levenson, *Genealogy*, 219. Lewis, introduction to *Cambridge Companion*, 8. Melaney, *After Ontology*, 1–3. Nicholls, *Modernisms*, 1–26.

149. Perry Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," in Nelson and Grossberg, *Marxism*, 323. Williams, *Politics*, 32–3, 51. For the original reception of early British modernists, see Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 2: 92. Ellis, *Russkie simvolisty*, 5. Mirskii, *Intellidzhentsia*, 54–6, 59. Poves and Kogan, *Modernisty*, 11–13. Riding and Graves, *Survey*, 42. Zhirmunskii, *Nemetskii romantizm*, 191–4. Wilson, *Axel's Castle*, 1, 23–5.

150. Ardis, *Modernism*, 45–77. J. W. Foster, "Romantic Revival, Modernist Prescription," in Buchloh, Guilbaut, and Solkin, *Modernism*, 65. Anthony Pym, "The Meaning of 'Life' in European Aesthetics at the End of the Nineteenth Century," in Berg, Durieux, and Lernout, *Turn of the Century*, 360. Sturgis, *Passionate Attitudes*, 2–3. Tillyard, *Impact*, xiii–xxiii. For a critical overview of periodizing practices in Anglo-American scholarship, see Morag Shiach, "Periodizing Modernism," in Brooker et al., *Oxford Handbook*, 17–30.

151. Maurice Samuels, "France," in Lewis, *Cambridge Companion*, 13. David Bathrick and Andreas Huyssen, "Modernism and the Experience of Modernity," in Huyssen and Bathrick, *Modernity*, 3.

152. Mannheim, "The Problem of Generations," *Essays*, 278–316. See also Chudakova, "Zametki o pokoleniiakh," *Literatura*, 382. Confino, "On Intellectuals," 137–43. Wohl, *Generation*, 203–10.

153. Miliukov, *Vospominaniia*, 1: 265–6. See also Bogomolov, "Serebrianyi vek," 137; "Prose between Symbolism and Realism," 21.

154. Anichkov, *Novaia russkaia poeziia*, 5–15. D. Maksimov, "'Severnyi vestnik' i simvolisty," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 109–13, 117, 122–4. Pyman, *History of Russian Symbolism*, 19–20, 37. Abram Reitblat, "Izdatel'stva novogo tipa," in Frolova, *Kniga*, 232–3. See also Pavlova, "'Etot preslovutyi plevok," 117–37.

155. Levenson, *Modernism*, 25. See also Williams, *Politics*, 51. Mints, "Novye romantiki," 149–56.

156. L'vov-Rogachevskii, *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*, 133. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 149–50, 176–9, 191. See also E. Tager, "Vozniknovenie modernizma," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 203.

157. Liubov' Gurevich, "Istoriia 'Severnogo vestnika,'" in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 240.

158. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 2: 58; *Istoriia*, 161, 203. Pavel Miliukov, "Intelligentsiia i istoricheskaia traditsiia," in *Intelligentsiia v Rossii*, 97, 101, 104; *Vospominaniia*, 1: 265–6. Semën Vengerov in *Kuda my idem?*, 23–4.

159. Anton Krainii [Gippius], "Literaturnye razmyshleniia," 147–8.

160. Glinskii, "Bolezn'," 630–1.

161. Pyman, *History of Russian Symbolism*, 168.

162. See the editorial in *Severnye tsvety* 3 (1903), n.p. Peterson, *History*, 43–5.

163. Remizov, "Dvoretskii," *Izbrannoe*, 567.

164. On *Fakely*, see Peterson, *History*, 91.

165. Belyi, "Neskol'ko slov dekadenta," 67; "Na perevale," 70. Khodasevich, "Andrei Belyi," *Nekropol'*, 51.

166. V. Briusov to M. Kuzmin (3/16 August 1907), in Kuzmin, "Stikhotvoreniia," 50. V. Gofman to A. Roslavlev (6 December 1904), in Lavrov, *Russkie simvolisty*, 350. See also Gennadii Obatnin, "'Vos'midesiatniki' i 'poteriannoe pokolenie 1914 goda,'" in Bagno, Malmstad, and Malikova, *Na rubezhe*, 456. Vladimir Veidle, "The Poison of Modernism," in Gibian and Tjalsma, *Russian Modernism*, 23–4.

167. Briusov (18 January 1910), "Perepiska s Viacheslavom Ivanovym," 524–5. For Tynianov's novelistic plans, see Kornei Chukovskii (24 May 1937), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 152.

168. Aleksandr Blok, "Vozmezdie.—Predislovie," *Sobranie*, 3: 296.

169. Blok (1 July 1906) and Briusov (19 January 1907) to Chulkov, in his *Gody*, 347, 371. See also Azadovskii and Maksimov, "Briusov," 286. Saianov, "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," 79–80, 84.

170. E. Tager et al., "Modernistskie techeniia i poeziia mezhrevoliutsionnogo desiatiletiia," in Bialik, Tager, and Shcherbina, *Russkaia literatura*, 3: 286–7.

171. L. Mandrykina, "Nenapisannaia kniga. 'Listki iz dnevnika' A. A. Akhmatovoi," in Voronova et al., *Knigi*, 70.

172. Robert Wohl, "The Generation of 1914 and Modernism," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 71–3.

173. Mickiewicz, "Problem," 10.

174. See Zhirmunskii, "Preodolevshie simvolizm," *Poetika*, 365–72. See also Akhmatova, *Zapisnye knizhki*, 557. Vasilii L'vov-Rogachevskii, "Simvolizm," in *Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov*, 2: 784.

175. Eikhenbaum, "Anna Akhmatova" (1923), *O poezii*, 76; *"Moi vremennik,"* 53–4.

176. Khlebnikov, "Zakon pokolenii" (1914), *Tvoreniia*, 648–52.

177. Eugene Lampert, "Modernism in Russia," in Bradbury and McFarlane, *Modernism*, 134.

178. Ronen, *Serebrianyi vek*, 113.

179. Bethea, "Literature," in Rzhevsky, *Cambridge Companion*, 178. Bogomolov, "Serebrianyi vek," 140. Bowlt, "Modernism," 284. Bristol, "Turn of a Century," 387, 457. Katerina Clark, "'Quiet Revolution' in Soviet Intellectual Life," 213–15, 221–2. Mikhail Gasparov, "Antinomichnost' poetiki russkogo modernizma," in Keldysh, *Sviaz'*, 264; "Poetika 'serebrianogo veka,'" 15–16. Graham Roberts, *Last Soviet Avant-Garde*, 13–14, 176. Rosenthal and Bohachevsky-Chomiak, *Revolution*, xii–xiii.

180. Dobrenko, *Formovka*, 9–10, 123. Etkind, "Edinstvo 'serebrianogo veka,'" 16. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 4–5. Boris Khazanov, "L'Année 1913," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 1: 430.

181. Kelly, introduction to *Utopias*, xxi–xxvi. Kling, "Evoliutsiia," 37–9. Ram, "Russia," 114–16.

182. Childs, *Modernism*, 15, 19.

183. Quinones, *Mapping*, 17–18.

184. Tyrus Miller, *Late Modernism*, 16. See also Armstrong, *Modernism*, 24. Davis, *Extinct Scene*, 4–11. Esty, *Shrinking Island*, 4–5. Genter, *Late Modernism*, 4–13. Mackay, *Modernism*, 1.

185. Eikhenbaum, "Dnevnik 1917–1918," 22; "Mig soznaniia" (1921), *"Moi vremennik,"* 533; "Sud'ba Bloka" (1921), *O literature*, 356–7, 366; "Anna Akhmatova" (1923), *O poezii*, 75. B. Livshits to M. Zenkevich (14 January 1934), in A. Parnis, "Pervaia kniga po istorii russkogo futurizma" (Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 235). Mirskii, "O nyneshnem sostoianii," 91–6.

186. Chudakova, "Opyt istoriko-sotsiologicheskogo analiza khudozhestvennykh tekstov," *Literatura*, 292–4.

187. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Vzgliad i nechto," in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 522; "Sovetskaia literatura" (1943), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 360–4.

188. See M. Chudakova, "Sotsial'naia praktika, filologicheskaia refleksiia i literatura v nauchnoi biografii Eikhenbauma i Tynianova," in Toddes, *Tynianovskii sbornik*, 2: 111–16. S. Zenkin, "'Pokolenie.' Opyt dekonstruktsii poniatiia," in Khrenov, *Pokolenie*, 133–4.

189. Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 5–6. Mirskii, "O nyneshnem sostoianii," 91–2.

190. Ginzburg, "Nikolai Oleinikov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 492; "Zabolotskii dvadtsatykh godov," in Zabolotskaia, *Vospominaniia*, 147–9. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 287; *Vtoraia kniga*, 32. "Ot redaktsii," *Chet i nechet*, 5. Terapiano, "Zhurnal," 26; "Chelovek," 210–12.

191. Veidle, "Chelovek," 139–42. See also Bayle, *Non-conformistes*, passim. Hynes, *Auden Generation*, 17 and passim. Mazgaj, *Imagining Fascism*, passim.

192. Poplavskii, "O misticheskoi atmosfere," 308–11. Varshavskii, "Neskol'ko rassuzhdenii," 216–22. See also Boldt, Segal, and Fleishman, "Problemy," 80. Papernyi, *Kul'tura*, 93–4.

193. Michel Décaudin, "Being Modern in 1885," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 28.

194. Khodasevich, "Konets Renaty" (1928), *Nekropol'*, 19–21; "O simvolizme" (1928), *Literaturnye stat'i*, 156–8.

195. Ginzburg, "Zapisi, ne opublikovannye pri zhizni," 391. See also Chudakova, "Zametki o pokoleniiakh," 381–4.

196. "Protiv burzhuaznykh tribunov," 1. Joyce, "Uliss," 3.

197. Chudakova, "Bez gneva i pristrastiia," *Literatura*, 331. Dobrenko, "Socialist Realism," in Dobrenko and Balina, *Cambridge Companion*, 98. Lazar Fleishman, "Belyi's Memoirs," in Malmstad, *Andrey Bely*, 231. See also Nikolai Bogomolov, "Neskol'ko razmyshlenii po povodu dvukh dat v istorii literatury sovetskogo perioda," in Musatov, *Nekalendarnyi XX vek*, 1: 84–6.

198. Adamovich, "Literaturnye zametki" (1929), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 200–1. Tal'nikov, "Literaturnye zametki," 193–4, 198. See also Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (24 January 1926; 5 September 1926), 2.

199. Adamovich, "'Khudozhnik neizvesten' V. Kaverina" (1932); "Sumasshedshii korabl'" (1932), *Literaturnye zametki*, 2: 21–4, 73. Bëm, "Ol'ga Forsh," 457–8; "O sovetskoi literature," 381–2. Ermilov, "Obostrenie," 3. Fadeev, "Za bol'shuiu literaturu," 2. Selivanovskii, "Khudozhnik," 2.

200. Anisimov, "O nasledstve," 1. Forsh, *Simvolisty*, *Letoshnii sneg*, 353–4. Mirskii, "Voprosy," 3; "Tendencies of the Modern Russian Novel" (1934), *Uncollected Writings*, 331. Maslin, "Dekadenty," 163–7. Mustangova, "Poeticheskie traditsii," 1–2. Karl Radek, "Sovremennaia mirovaia literatura i zadachi proletarskogo iskusstva," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s''ezd*, 315. See also Katerina Clark, *Moscow*, 161–2. Genieva, *"Russkaia odisseia,"* 16.

201. See the issues 12, 13, and 18 of *Literaturnaia gazeta* (24 and 29 February; 27 March 1936). Levin, "Vyzhech'," 2. Romashov, "Unichtozhit'," 4.

202. Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 462. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Pisatel'skie sud'by" (1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 337. Malmstad, preface to *Andrey Bely*, 10.

203. On the evolving demographics of cultural production and consumption, see Katerina Clark, "'Quiet Revolution' in Soviet Intellectual Life," 225–6. Dobrenko, *Formovka*, passim. Mikhail Gasparov, "Stikh nachala XX v.," in Keldysh, *Sviaz'*, 375.

204. Kornei Chukovskii (11 August and 31 December 1925), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 346, 356. Kuzmin (16 May 1934), *Dnevnik 1934 goda*, 31. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 44. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 194–6, 365; *Vtoraia kniga*, 525.

205. Adamovich, "O polozhenii," 299–300.

206. N. Berberova (26 May 1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 44. V. Rudnev to P. Bitsilli (1940), in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 2: 640, 643, 645.

207. Terapano to Lidiia Ivannikova (27 February 1962), in Alexis Rannit Papers, Box 29, Folder "Iurii Terapiano" (Beinecke). See also Ivanov-Razumnik to F. Stepun (5 June 1942; 10 November 1944), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 125–6, 132.

208. See Ianovskii to F. Stepun (1953, n.d.), in Fedor Stepun Papers, Box 15, Folder 496 "Ianowsky, V. S. 1953–58" (Beinecke).

Chapter 4. Navigating Russia's Cultures of Modernity

1. Robert Wohl, "The Generation of 1914 and Modernism," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 68–72.

2. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 317.

3. Fondaminskii, "Zelenaia lampa," 44–5. Semën Frank, "Etika nigilizma"; Pëtr Struve, "Intelligentsiia i revoliutsiia," in *Vekhi*, 172, 204. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Chto takoe intelligentsiia*, 14–22. Stepun, "Po povodu," 320. See also Confino, "On Intellectuals," 117–18. Paperno, *Chernyshevsky*, 4–7. Pipes, *Russian Revolution*, 122–3, 140. Riasanovsky, *Parting*, 295. Szamuely, *Russian Tradition*, 144–5.

4. Fitzpatrick, *Tear Off the Masks!*, 72–3. Martin Malia, "What Is the Intelligentsia?"; Pipes, "The Historical Evolution of the Russian Intelligentsia," in Pipes, *Russian Intelligentsia*, 5–6, 52. Nahirny, *Russian Intelligentsia*, 12–14.

5. Philip Abrams, "Rites," 179, 183–4. Miliukov, *Vospominaniia*, 1: 291; "Intelligentsiia i istoricheskaia traditsiia," in *Intelligentsiia v Rossii*, 97, 101.

6. Confino, "On Intellectuals," 143.

7. Burbank, *Intelligentsia*, 8–10. Neuberger, *Hooliganism*, 7, 254. Pipes, *Struve*, 110–11.

8. Briusov (23 February 1899), *Dnevniki. Avtobiograficheskaia proza*, 78.

9. N. Gredeskul, "Perelom russkoi intelligentsii i ego deistvitel'nyi smysl"; D. Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, "Psikhologiia russkoi intelligentsii," in *Intelligentsiia v Rossii*, 11–15, 217. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Literatura i obshchestvennost'*, 109–10. A. Izgoev, "O zadachakh intelligentsii" (1922), in Glavatskii, *"Filosofskii parokhod,"* 46–7. See also Pipes, "Historical Evolution of the Russian Intelligentsia," 50–6. Poltoratzky, "*Vekhi* Dispute," 97–103. Charles Rougle, "The Intelligentsia Debate in Russia 1917–1918," in Nilsson, *Art*, 70–102.

10. Pavel Novgorodtsev, "O putiakh i zadachakh russkoi intelligentsii"; Pëtr Struve, "Istoricheskii smysl russkoi revoliutsii," in *Iz glubiny*, 251–68, 291–2. Z. Gippius's correspondence with M. Vishniak and I. Fondaminskii (15/18, 22 January, 17 July 1924), ed. N. Bogomolov, in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 3: 239, 241, 270. See also Scott Smith, *Captives*, 215–16.

11. Confino, "On Intellectuals," 138–43. B. Kolonitskii, "Identifikatsii rossiiskoi intelligentsii i intelligentofobiia," in Sdvizhkov, *Intelligentsiia*, 157–9. Nahirny, *Russian Intelligentsia*, 15–16. See also Gershenzon's letter (no. 12) to Ivanov in their *Perepiska*, 80.

12. Eikhenbaum, "Literatura i pisatel'," *"Moi vremennik,"* 72; "Metody," 13–14. O. Mandel'shtam, *Shum vremeni*, *Sochineniia*, 2: 15–17. See also Prishvin (3 April 1918), *Dnevniki 1918–1919*, 56.

13. Belyi, "Na perevale," 70; "Neskol'ko slov," 67; "Krititsizm i simvolizm" (1904), *Simvolizm*, 30. See also Chulkov, "Chetvertyi sbornik," 292. Shklovskii, *Tret'ia fabrika* (1926), *Gamburgskii schet*, 102–3.

14. Avrelii [Briusov], "A. L. Volynskii," 67. Belyi, "Shtempelevannaia kalosha," 50–2; "Poet mramora i bronzy" (1907), *Arabeski*, 448–50; "Vol'nootpushchenniki," 71; "Slovo pravdy," 59–60. Chudovskii, "Futurizm," 25–29; "O Merezhkovskom," 47–52. Kornei Chukovskii, "Predislovie," *Ot Chekhova*, iv–v. Ellis, "O sovremennom simvolizme," 75. Empirik [Tasteven], "Prichiny," 79–80. Gumilev, "Nasledie," 42. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Staryi i novyi mir," *God*, 190; "27 fevralia 1917," *Pered grozoi*, 132, 136; "Vzgliad i nechto" (1925), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 536–43. Khodasevich, "Dekol'tirovannaia loshad'" (1927), *Nekropol'*, 219–23. Pant-ov, "Sbornik," 52–53. "Programma. Za chto boretsia LEF," 3–6. "Torzhestvuiushchii oboz," 2. Tret'iakov, "Otkuda i kuda?," 193–4. Terapiano, "Okol'nye puti," 35; "Zhurnal," 26.

15. Gorky to Andreev (8/12 August 1907; 21 October 1911), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 287–8, 318–19. Trotskii, "Ob intelligentsii" (1912), *Literatura*, 258–72. See also Kolonitskii, "Identifikatsii rossiiskoi intelligentsii i intelligentofobiia," 161–2.

16. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 387–90.

17. Berdiaev, "Kul'tura," 320–5. Fondaminskii, "Zelenaia lampa," 44–5. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura ot semidesiatykh godov*, 361; *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 11.

18. Art Berman, *Preface*, 4–5.

19. Bronner, *Modernism*, 11. Silverman, *Art Nouveau*, 173. Tillyard, *Impact*, 52–5.

20. Minskii, "Sotsial-gumanizm," *Na obshchestvennye temy*, 62.

21. Belyi, *Pochemu*, 103–4. Fedotov, "Bor'ba," 38–9. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 90–1. Stepun, "Porevoliutsionnoe soznanie," 15–16. "Ot redaktsii," *Pereval* 1 (1906), 4.

22. A. Lunacharskii, "Dvadtsat' tretii sbornik 'Znaniia,'" in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 2: 84. Trotskii, "Ob intelligentsii," 258–72.

23. Belyi, "Teatr i sovremennaia drama," *Arabeski*, 21, 31; "Detskaia svistul'ka," 58; "E. V. Anichkov," 100. See also Briusov, "Kliuchi," 21. Kornei Chukovskii, "Tsiferblat," 48–51. Chulkov, *O misticheskom anarkhizme*, 50–5; "Chetvertyi sbornik," 290–3; *Gody*, 82–4. Eikhenbaum (10 August 1917), in "Perepiska B. M. Eikhenbauma i V. M. Zhirmunskogo," 292. Eikhenbaum (27 August 1917), "Dnevnik 1917–1918," 13. Filosofov, "Natsionalizm," 209–11. V. Ivanov, "Poet," 8. Minskii, "Istoriia moego redaktorstva," *Na obshchestvennye temy*, 194. Mirskii, "Valerii Iakovlevich Briusov," 416; *Contemporary Russian Literature*, 15–52. Vengerova, "Predislovie," *Literaturnye kharakteristiki*, 1: i–ii.

24. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Svoe litso"; "Tri stupeni," *God*, 78–82. Ivanov-Razumnik and Sergei Mstislavskii, "Skifskii manifest" (1917), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 1: 23–5. Ivanov-

Razumnik to L. Slonimskaia (18 June 1941), "Dukhovnoe zaveshchanie," 111–12. Khodasevich to Gorky (28 June 1923), *Sobranie*, 4: 460–1; and to B. Sadovskoi (15 December 1917; 3 April 1919; 10 February 1920), *Nekropol'*, 359–64. Minskii, "Sotsial-gumanizm," 63–72. V. Pertsov, "Grafik," 15–17. Prishvin (10 May 1931), *Dnevniki 1930–1931*, 376–77. Punin, "O forme," 1. Tasteven, *Futurizm*, 34–6, 41, 78–9. Tomashevskii, "Formal'nyi metod" (1922), in Ivanov-Razumnik, *Sovremennaia literatura*, 149–50.

25. Briusov, "Svoboda," 61–6. "Ot redaktsii," *Pereval* 1 (1906), 3–4.

26. "Otdel Iskusstva Komissariata Prosveshcheniia. K rabochim i khudozhnikam" (leaflet, 1918), N. N. Punin Diaries and Correspondence, Box 1, Folder 3 "Diary, 1920–21." See also Brik, "Khudozhnik-proletarii," 1. "Programma. Za chto boretsia LEF?," 4. Tret'iakov, "Otkuda i kuda?," 203.

27. Eikhenbaum, "V ozhidanii," 284–6. Shklovskii, *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*, 31. For Marxist polemics, see Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.3: 113–14. Trotskii, "Futurizm"; "Formal'naia shkola poezii i marksizm," *Literatura*, 111, 130, 142.

28. Anichkov, *Realizm*, 55–6. Brik, "Za politiku!," 20–2. Briusov, "Bal'mont," 30. Chuzhak, "Pod znakom," 12–22. "Programma. Za chto boretsia LEF," 10. Tret'iakov, "Otkuda i kuda?," 193–5. Volynskii, "Predislovie," *Bor'ba*, ii–iii.

29. Fedotov, "Chetverodnevnyi Lazar'," 140.

30. Ellis, "Nashi epigony," 61. Belyi, "Ob itogakh razvitiia novogo russkogo iskusstva," *Arabeski*, 262.

31. Aron, *Opium*, 54–6. Matei Calinescu, "Modernism and Ideology," in Chefdor, Quinones, and Wachtel, *Modernism*, 81. Compagnon, *Cinq paradoxes*, 51–3.

32. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 5–27. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 2–5.

33. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 73, 193–5, 204; 2: 74–6. Kornei Chukovskii, "Darvinizm i Leonid Andreev" (1902), *Sobranie*, 6: 238. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura ot semidesiatykh godov*, 361; *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 11.

34. Bëm, "O kritike i kritikakh" (1931), *Pis'ma*, 42–3. Saianov, "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," *Ot klassikov*, 94. Selivanovskii, *Ocherki*, 77. Volkov, *Poeziia*, 35–7, 55.

35. Aleksandrovich, *Istoriia*, 203–4. See also Gennadii Obatnin, "'Vos'midesiatniki' i 'poteriannoe pokolenie 1914 goda,'" in Bagno, Malmstad, and Malikova, *Na rubezhe*, 457–8.

36. Minskii, "Istoriia moego redaktorstva," 193–6.

37. Remizov, "Poslushnyi samokei," *Izbrannoe*, 581. Sobolev, "K istorii 'Zelenogo sbornika stikhov i prozy,'" *Leteiskaia biblioteka*, 2: 93–111.

38. Boris Legran, "Predislovie" (1929), in Bogdanov, *Krasnaia zvezda*, 8–9. See also Banerjee, *We Modern People*, 142–52. Clowes, *Revolution*, 204–23.

39. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 84.

40. Prishvin (23 January 1938), *Dnevniki 1938–1939*, 21. Vishniak, "Opravdanie," 324.

41. Mirskii, "O sovremennom sostoianii russkoi poezii" (1922), *Uncollected Writings*, 95.

42. Katerina Clark, *Petersburg*, xi. See also L. Andreev to V. Veresaev (April 1906), in Andreev and Beklemisheva, *Rekviem*, 163–64. Belyi, "Nikolai Il'ich Storozhenko," 67. Belyi to Ivanov-Razumnik (17 January 1918), *Perepiska*, 153. Merezhkovskii, "Tsvety meshchanstva" (1908), *V tikhom omute*, 71–77; "Sem' smirennykh" (1909), in Sapov, *Vekhi*, 104–5. V. V. Ivanov, "Predislovie redaktora angliiskogo izdaniia," in Ronen, *Serebrianyi vek*, 17n5.

43. Kornei Chukovskii (22 October 1967; 17 September 1968), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 397, 455. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 278–81. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 129–31, 387–90; *Vtoraia kniga*, 24–5.

44. Clowes, *Revolution*, 204–23. Groys, "Nitssheanskie temy," 104–8. Hans Günther, "Geroi v totalitarnoi kul'ture," in Gassner, *Agitatsiia*, 71–2. Halfin, "Rape of the Intelligentsia," 91–2. Bengt Jangfeldt, "Nietzsche and the Young Maiakovskii"; Gregory Freidin, "Revolution as an Esthetic Phenomenon"; Mikhail Agursky, "Nietzschean Roots of Stalinist Culture," in Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Nietzsche*, 35–57, 151–8, 256–81. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *New Myth*, 326.

45. Chaadaev, "O psevdorevoliutsionerakh," 187. N. Mandel'stham, *Vospominaniia*, 129–31. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 132.

46. Gor'kii, "Nesvoevremennye mysli" (10/23 December 1917; 24 May/6 June 1918), *Nesvoevremennye mysli*, 130, 256–60; letter to Lenin (16/19 September 1919), in I. Reviakina, "Pis'ma M. Gor'kogo k V. I. Leninu" (Keldysh, Barakhov, and Zaika, *Neizvestnyi Gor'kii*, 31).

47. Voronskii, "V. V. Veresaev" (1922), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 81–2.

48. Kornei Chukovskii (31 December 1925), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 355–6; (1 and 5 June 1930; 14 October 1932; 22 April, 3 and 18 August 1936), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 9–10, 72, 141–5.

49. Shklovskii, *Rozanov*, 7.

50. Kornei Chukovskii, "Tretii sort," *Ot Chekhova*, 151.

51. "Revoliutsiia dukha," 6–15. See also Perloff, *Futurist Moment*, xx. Stromberg, *Redemption*, 179–98.

52. Annenkov, *Dnevnik*, 1: 102–3. Kornei Chukovskii (3 January 1921), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 153–4. Khodasevich to B. Sadovskoi (15 December 1917; 3 April 1919; 10 February 1920), *Nekropol'*, 359–64; and to B. Diatropov (9 July 1922), *Sobranie*, 4: 447–8. Zamiatin, "Novaia russkaia proza," *Litsa*, 195.

53. Sergei Bulgakov, "Geriozm i podvizhnichestvo"; Semën Frank, "Etika nigilizma," in *Vekhi*, 28–9, 204. Merezhkovskii, "Griadushchii kham" (1906), *V tikhom omute*, 375–6.

54. Berdiaev, *Krizis*, 4–5, 20. Ellis, "Krizis," 63–6.

55. Lunacharskii, *Religiia*, 2: 139–40, 326, 347. See also Berdiaev, *Filosofiia*, 136, 151. Minskii, "Narod i intelligentsiia," 109–10. P. Struve, "Religiia," 149–56.

56. George Steiner, *Nostalgia*, 4–11.

57. M. H. Abrams, *Natural Supernaturalism*, 313–14. Aron, *Opium*, 78, 95–7. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 228–9. Ruether, *Radical Kingdom*, 283.

58. Minskii, "Sotsial-gumanizm," 69–70. See also Berdiaev, *Filosofiia*, 22, 62.

59. Figes, *Whisperers*, 31–5. Griffin, *Modernism*, 174–5.

60. Filosofov, "Druz'ia," 134.

61. Sobolev, "Merezhkovskie," 353. See also I. Fondaminskii to Z. Gippius (17 July 1924), "Ne vezet mne s 'Sovremennymi zapiskami.' Z. N. Gippius, D. S. Merezhkovskii i V. A. Zlobin," ed. N. Bogomolov, in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 3: 270.

62. Mirskii, "The Literature of Bolshevik Russia" (1921), *Uncollected Writings*, 72–73.

63. Merezhkovskii, "L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii" (1902), *L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii*, 349–50; "Meschanstvo," 33–5. See also Lynn Patyk, "The Byronic Terrorist," in Anemone, *Just Assassins*, 167, 172.

64. Ol'ga Eikhenbaum, "Iz vospominanii," in Eikhenbaum, *"Moi vremennik,"* 614–15. Geller, "Smutnyi mif," 442.

65. Lekmanov, *Zhizn'*, 25, 82–6.

66. Adamovich, "Literaturnye besedy" (10 August 1925), 2. Aseev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 72. Belyi, *Pochemu*, 103–4. Eikhenbaum, "Sud'ba Bloka" (1921), *O literature*, 357–63. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Ispytanie v groze i bure," in Ivanov-Razumnik and Blok, *Ispytanie*, 12–37; *Tiur'my*, 43. Mirskii, "The Literature of Bolshevik Russia," 72–3; *Contemporary Russian Literature*, 242. Shletser, "Znamia," 403–8. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 230–1.

67. Eikhenbaum, "Mysli o revoliutsii" (1918), *"Moi vremennik,"* 509. Ivanov-Razumnik to Belyi (November 1924), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 770–3. Khodasevich to Gorky (28 June 1923), *Sobranie*, 4: 460–1. Shklovskii, *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*, 201, 242–4; letter to Gorky (20 April 1922), "Pis'ma M. Gor'komu," 31–2. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 28–9. See also Stefani Hoffman, "Scythian Theory and Literature, 1917–1924," in Nilsson, *Art*, 154–9.

68. Ruether, *Radical Kingdom*, 104–9.

69. Dunham, *In Stalin's Time*, 130–1. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 209. Gide, *Retour*, 62–7. "Spetssoobshchenie sekretno-politicheskogo otdela GUGB" (1936), in Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 312. See also Figes, *Whisperers*, 157–59. Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism*, 12–13.

70. Belyi, "Poet mramora i bronzy," 450.

71. Belyi, "Kumir," 70–5. Figes, *People's Tragedy*, 634. Geller, "Smutnyi mif," 442–3. Gurianova, *Aesthetics*, 220–31. Miliukov, *Ocherki*, 2: 329–36. Gennadii Obatnin, "Russkii modernizm i anarkhizm," in Vakhtina, Dolinin, and Kats, *Etkindovskie chteniia*, 2–3: 118–19.

72. Budnitskii, *Terrorizm*, 185–6, 357. Confino, "On Intellectuals," 141. Malia, "What Is the Intelligentsia?," 16–17. Hugh Seton-Watson, "The Russian Intellectuals" (1955), in Huszar, *Intellectuals*, 50.

73. Shklovskii, *Gamburgskii schet*, 188. P. Struve, "Pochemu," 104–6.

74. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 76, 159. Anichkov, "Poslednie pobegi," 106–7. Ellis, "Ivanov-Razumnik," 55–7.

75. Filosofov, "Dela," 3.

76. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 318. See also Poltoratzky, "*Vekhi* Dispute," 97–104.

77. M. Voloshin to his mother (29 August 1901), *Maksimilian Voloshin*, 3: 303–4.

78. Chudovskii, "Russkaia mysl'," 73. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 20.

79. Ivanov-Razumnik, "P. L. Lavrov i Kommuna" (1920), in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 1: 188–9.

80. See Tynianov's statement in Kornei Chukovskii (23 May 1927), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 402.

81. Ivanov-Razumnik, *Tiur'my*, 32–3. Prishvin, "Okhota za schast'em" (1926), *Sobranie*, 3: 13. See also M. Petrova, "Estetika pozdnego narodnichestva," in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 170.

82. Lavrov, "Dva memoranduma Maksimiliana Voloshina. I. Pis'mo k Borisu Savinkovu," *Russkie simvolisty*, 330–3. Patyk, "Byronic Terrorist," 165–82. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 163–4, 205. Savinkov's letters to Sophia Petit (29 August, 3 September 1908) describe his work on *The Pale Horse*, Fonds Eugène et Sophia Petit, F delta rés 571 (4) (3), BDIC.

83. Evgenii Bershtein, "Tragediia pola," in Pavlova, *Erotizm*, 72–4.

84. Asmus, "Filosofiia," 20–1. Gor'kii, "Doklad o sovetskoi literature," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s"ezd*, 12. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 767. Lelevich, "Nam nuzhna," 108. Lunacharskii, *Ot Spinozy*, 123. Viacheslav Polonskii, "O Maiakovskom" (1930), *O literature*, 213. Trotskii, "Partiinaia politika v iskusstve," *Literatura*, 169.

85. For Marxist criticism, see V. Bazarov, "Avtoritarnaia metafizika i avtonomnaia lichnost'"; V. Shuliatikov, "Vosstanovlenie razrushennoi estetiki," in Dorovatovskii and Charushnikov, *Ocherki*, 252, 586, 629–30. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.3: 58–67. Lunacharskii, *Religiia*, 2: 210. Plekhanov, "Evangelie ot dekadansa" (1909), *Literatura*, 2: 468–79. For modernist rejoinders, see Berdiaev, "Revoliutsiia," 146–54; "Kul'tura," 323, 330–1. Kornei Chukovskii, "Chekhov i proletarstvuiushchee meshchanstvo" (1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 531–2. Filosofov, "Gor'kii o religii," 78. Merezhkovskii, "Meshchanstvo," 35; "Griadushchii kham," 356. Minskii, "Sotsial-gumanizm," 63–6. Pentaur, "*Ocherki*," 75. "V zhurnalakh i gazetakh," 79.

86. Iu. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 1: 5–20. Vorovskii, "O burzhuaznosti modernistov" (1908), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 197–201. See Belyi's rejoinder, "Literaturnyi raspad," 70–2.

87. Chernov, "Modernizm v russkoi poezii," 125–8.

88. Kornei Chukovskii, "Tsiferblat," 48–51.

89. Kornei Chukovskii, "Russkaia literatura <v 1907 godu>" (1908), *Sobranie*, 6: 555.

90. Berdiaev, "Revoliutsiia," 146–54.

91. Bal'mont to Briusov (30 August/12 September 1907), in Briusov, "Perepiska s K. D. Bal'montom," 188. Briusov to Z. Gippius (18 June 1907), "Pis'ma k peterburgskim i moskovskim literatoram," 698.

92. Chulkov, "Liliia i roza," *Pokryvalo*, 38. Minskii, "Istoriia moego redaktorstva," 198–9.

93. Plekhanov, "Predislovie k tret'emu izdaniiu sbornika 'Za dvadtsat' let,'" *Literatura*, 1: 127–8.

94. Gorky-Andreev letters (8/12, 13 August 1907), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 287–92. For Gorky's ties to early modernist culture, see A. Pogosova, "Pis'ma M. Gor'kogo A. L. Volynskomu i v redaktsiiu zhurnala 'Severnyi Vestnik,'" in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 355–8. On Gorky's fusion of Marxism and Nietzscheanism, see Clowes, *Revolution*, 198–9. Günther, "Geroi v totalitarnoi kul'ture," 71–2. Miliukov, *Ocherki*, 2: 335.

95. Arabazhin, *Etiudy*, 135–41.

96. Trotskii, "Dlia krasoty sloga" (1908), *Literatura*, 239.

97. Berdiaev, "Filosofskaia istina i intelligentskaia pravda," in *Vekhi*, 7. Sologub, "Zametki," 3–4: 59–61. Trotskii, "Ob intelligentsii," 258–72.

98. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 607, 616, 793. See also Gorky to Andreev (21 October 1911), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 318–19. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," 53. Vorovskii, "V noch' posle bitvy" (1908), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 196.

99. Berdiaev, *Filosofiia*, 136, 151. See also Ivanov-Razumnik, "'Proletarskaia literatura' i 'sotsialisticheskii realizm'" (1943), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 358.

100. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 18–20.

101. Sheila Fitzpatrick, "Cultural Revolution as Class War," *Cultural Revolution*, 8, 28; *Everyday Stalinism*, 12; *Tear Off the Masks!*, 29–32, 74–85. Figes, *People's Tragedy*, 611, 687–8, 758–62. Figes and Kolonitskii, *Interpreting*, 105–6.

102. Brik, "Khudozhnik-proletarii," 1. Lezhnev, "'Levoe' iskusstvo i ego sotsial'nyi smysl," *O literature*, 90. Maiskii, "O kul'ture," 271. Malakhov, "Teoriia," 54–6. Polianskii, "Kto zhe iavliaetsia proletarskim pisatelem?," 198–200. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Oktiabr' i khudozhestvennaia literatura," *O sovremennoi literature*, 256–9; "Khudozhestvennoe tvorchestvo," 21–2, 33. Voronskii, "Prozaiki i poety 'Kuznitsy,'" *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 183–4. Zhukov, "Protiv klichek," 256–61. See also Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 209–19. Bengt Jangfeldt, "Russian Futurism 1917–1919," in Nilsson, *Art*, 115–17. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*, 2.1: 172–5, 195–6; 2.2: 484. Mally, *Culture*, xxiv–xxvi, 106–19, 230.

103. Eikhenbaum, "Sud'ba Bloka" (1921), *O literature*, 357–63.

104. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 37–38. Groys, *Total Art*, 21–3.

105. Trotskii, "Vneoktiabr'skaia literatura"; "Futurizm"; "Iskusstvo revoliutsii i sotsialisticheskoe iskusstvo," *Literatura*, 30–1, 107, 183.

106. Lunacharskii, "'Tri tolstiaka' Iu. Oleshi" (1930), *Stat'i*, 510–12. Karl Radek, "Sovremennaia mirovaia literatura i zadachi proletarskogo iskusstva," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s"ezd*, 317–18.

107. Kornei Chukovskii (28 January 1933), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 76.

108. Eikhenbaum, "O 'prostykh veshchakh' i azbuchnykh istinakh" (1926), *O literature*, 427. Khodasevich, "Literatura i vlast' v sov. Rossii" (1931), *Nekropol'*, 234. V. Pertsov, "Marksizm(y)," 24–5. Shklovskii, "Beseda o proletarskoi kul'ture 21 marta 1920," in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 1: 225–6.

109. Freidin, *Coat*, passim. Khodasevich, "Gumilev i Blok" (1931), *Nekropol'*, 86–7. Alexander Zholkovsky, "The Obverse of Stalinism," in Engelstein and Sandler, *Self and Story*, 46–67.

110. "Deklaratsiia Literaturnogo Tsentra Konstruktivistov," in Zelinskii and Sel'vinskii, *Gosplan*, 9. On Formalist linguistic theories, see Gorham, *Speaking*, 42–5.

111. Ermilov, "RAPP," 2. Kogan, "Serafimovich," 139–44. "Lef i MAPP," 3. "Soglashenie Mosk. Assotsiatsii Prolet. Pisatelei MAPP i gruppy LEF," 4–5. See also Dobrenko, *Formovka*, 42–7, 237. Sheshukov, *Neistovye revniteli*, 12–14, 30–50.

112. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 9–11. Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 210–19.

113. Olesha, *Kniga*, 65.

114. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 219. Malia, "What Is the Intelligentsia?," 3.

115. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vtoraia kniga*, 538.

116. Dunham, *In Stalin's Time*, 130–1. Figes, *Whisperers*, 157–59. Gide, *Retour*, 62–7.

117. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 100.

118. Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia*, 4, 92–116, 295–7, 355–6. McReynolds, *News*, 113–17, 162. Abram Reitblat, "Vzaimootnosheniia avtorov i izdatelei," in Frolova, *Kniga*, 441–8.

119. Louise McReynolds, "V. M. Doroshevich," in Clowes, Kassow, and West, *Between Tsar*, 236–47; *News*, 165–6 and passim.

120. Petrishchev, "Zabytaia godovshchina," 2.

121. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nat Pinkerton i sovremennaia literatura" (1908), *Kniga*, 42–66. See also Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 203–6, 2: 36–7. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 138. Merezhkovskii, "Nesolënaia sol'," *Bylo*, 229–33.

122. S. Bulgakov, "Geroizm i podvizhnichestvo"; S. Frank, "Etika nigilizma"; A. Izgoev, "Ob intelligentnoi molodezhi," in *Vekhi*, 25–41, 97–109, 202–4.

123. N. Gredeskul, "Perelom russkoi intelligentsii i ego deistvitel'nyi smyl"; P. Miliukov, "Intelligentsiia i istoricheskaia traditsiia," in *Intelligentsiia v Rossii*, 16, 21, 110.

124. Albert Perry, "Jan Waclaw Machajski," in A. Vol'skii [Machajski], *Umstvennyi rabochii*, 10–16. Pipes, *Russian Revolution*, 135. Sologub dramatized this accusation in his novel *The Created Legend* (*Tvorimaia legenda*, 13–17, 72, 160–1), later repeating it in his journalistic writings. See Rougle, "Intelligentsia Debate in Russia 1917–1918," 76–9.

125. A. Bogdanov, "Novoe srednevekov'e," in Ermichev, *N. A. Berdiaev*, 130. Gor'kii, "Vnimaniiu rabochikh" (1917), *Nesvoevremennye mysli*, 112–13. Levidov, "Organizovannoe uproshchenie," 306–18. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Zametki," 276–80. Prishvin (3 April, 25 December 1918), *Dnevniki 1918–1919*, 55–6, 202. V. Shuliatikov, "Nearistokraticheskii aristokratizm," in *Literaturnyi raspad*, 2: 231. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," 5, 14. Toropetskii, "Povorot," 148, 157. See also Figes, *Whisperers*, 13–19. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 4–5, 226–7; *Everyday Stalinism*, 103–5. Ginzburg "Zapisnye knizki" (1943); "Zapisi 1950–1960-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 173–7, 230–1. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 99–100. Pipes, *Russian Revolution*, 132.

126. Adamovich, "Sud'by sovetskoi literatury" (1930), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 386–90. Kornei Chukovskii (15 October 1918, 9 July 1919, 2 January 1920), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 93, 114, 136. Chukovskaia, *Zapiski*, 2: 275–7, 353. Khodasevich, "Dekol'tirovannaia loshad'"; "O smerti Gor'kogo"; "Belyi koridor," *Nekropol'*, 210, 222–3, 256. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 131. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 44, 61, 132–3, 136–7, 187. M. Vishniak to O. Gruzenberg (4 October 1933), ed. V. Khazan, in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 3: 601. See also N. Bogomolov, "K izucheniiu literaturnoi zhizni 1920-kh godov," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 289. Fitzpatrick, "Cultural Revolution as Class War," *Cultural Revolution*, 19–20, 36–8. Fontenot, "Symbolism," 241–56. Hellman, *Poets*, 249–51. Jangfeldt, *Stavka*, 110–11, 175, 279. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 205–6. Walker, *Maximilian Voloshin*, 5–11, 118–19, 154–9, 191–3.

127. Aron, *Opium*, 215–309. Carey, *Intellectual*, i, 17. Gouldner, *Future*, 1–20, 54–82. Graña, *Bohemian*, 193–5. Ringer, *Decline*, 1–13. Ignazio Silone, "On the Place of the Intellect and the Pretensions of the Intellectual," in Huszar, *Intellectuals*, 262–3. Winock, *Siècle*, 2–31, 761.

128. Katerina Clark, *Petersburg*, 20–22. Freidin, *Coat*, 215–74. Loewen, *Most Dangerous Art*, 95. Zholkovsky, "Obverse of Stalinism," 48–67. For arguments to the contrary, see Confino, "On Intellectuals," 137, 143. Szamuely, *Russian Tradition*, 147.

129. Brandenberger, *Propaganda State*, 25.

130. Chudakova, "Skvoz' zvezdy k terniiam," *Literatura*, 345–8. Dobrenko, "Socialist Realism," in Dobrenko and Balina, *Cambridge Companion*, 100.

131. Anisimov, "O nasledstve," 1. See also Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 171.

132. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 9–11.

133. Kornei Chukovskii, "Revoliutsiia i literatura" (1906); "Ob Aleksandre Bloke"

(1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 391, 545–6. Lavrov, "Briusov i Ivan Konevskoi," *Russkie simvolisty*, 100.

134. Mikhail Gasparov, "Poetika 'serebrianogo veka,'" in Gasparov and Koretskaia, *Russkaia poeziia*, 42.

135. Belyi, "Prorok bezlichiia" (1908), *Arabeski*, 3–4. Briusov, "Andrei Belyi. *Zoloto v lazuri*. Viacheslav Ivanov. *Prozrachnost'*" (1904), *Dalekie*, 125. Meierkhol'd, "Iz pisem," 95.

136. Merezhkovskii, "O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniiakh sovremennoi russkoi literatury," *Izbrannye stat'i*, 223–7. See also Belyi, "Simvolizm kak miroponimanie," 177.

137. Viacheslav Ivanov, "Poet," 6–8; "Novye maski," 2–3.

138. Joan Grossman, "Aleksandr Dobroljubov," in Dobroliubov, *Sochineniia*, 7–18.

139. Ellis, "Materialy dlia literaturnogo manifesta" (1907); letter to V. Briusov (June–July 1907), in Lavrov, "Ellis v 'Vesakh'" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 293–4, 303–4). Ivanov-Razumnik, *Russkaia literatura XX veka*, 32–4. Anton Krainii [Z. Gippius], "O 'Shipovnike,'" 54–5.

140. O. Lekmanov, "Russkii modernizm i massovaia poeziia," in Musatov, *Nekalendarnyi XX vek*, 7. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 202. Stone, "Aleksandr Blok," 638.

141. Aleksandr Blok, "Voprosy," 66. McReynolds, "V. M. Doroshevich," 239.

142. Aleksandr Blok, "Rossiia i intelligentsia," 78–85; "Intelligentsiia i revoliutsiia" (1918), *Sobranie*, 6: 9–20. Shklovskii, *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*, 235–6, 241–2.

143. A. Kruchenykh, "Novye puti slova," in Markov, *Manifesty*, 68.

144. Cooper, *Modernism*, 4.

145. Steklov, "Sotsial'no-politicheskie usloviia literaturnogo raspada," 5, 13–14. Shuliatikov, "Nearistokraticheskii aristokratizm," 231.

146. Abramov, "Vysokolobyi," 1. Gor'kii, "O formalizme," 2. Nusinov, "Maski," 3. "Usilit' bor'bu s formalizmom," 1.

147. Perry Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," in Nelson and Grossberg, *Marxism*, 325. Jean-Richard Bloch, "Rech'," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s''ezd*, 189–91. Hobsbawm, *Age*, 261. Pippin, *Modernism*, 32. Poggioli, *Theory*, 51, 114–16. Rowland, *Literature*, 173, 187–91. Charles Russell, "The Context of the Concept," in Garvin, *Romanticism*, 185.

148. Michael Murphy, "One Hundred Per Cent Bohemia," in Dettmar and Watt, *Marketing*, 64–6.

149. See a comparison of the RAPP's and the LEF's agendas in Dobrenko, *Formovka*, 65–8.

150. Paperno, introduction to Paperno and Grossman, *Creating Life*, 9–11.

151. Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, vii–viii.

152. Ardis, *Modernism*, 5–6. Dettmar, introduction to Dettmar and Watt, *Marketing*, 5–6. Scholes and Wulfman, *Modernism*, 35. Wexler, *Who Paid*, xiii–xv.

153. Thomas Crow, "Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts," in Buchloh, Guilbaut, and Solkin, *Modernism*, 215–55. Gluck, *Popular Bohemia*, vii, 2–5. North, *Reading 1922*, 10, 206–7. Strychacz, *Modernism*, 6–7.

154. Ferrall, *Modernist Writing*, 3–6. Elizabeth Miller, *Slow Print*, 2–8, 300–1.

155. Jeffrey Brooks, "Popular Philistinism and the Course of Russian Modernism," in Morson, *Literature*, 108–9. Daniel Orlovsky, "The Lower Middle Strata in Revolutionary Russia," in Clowes, Kassow, and West, *Between Tsar*, 249–68.

156. Kornei Chukovskii, "My i oni," *Litsa*, 78, 179.

157. Jeffrey Brooks, "Popular Philistinism and the Course of Russian Modernism," 90–1, 110. Dobrenko, "The Disaster of Middlebrow Taste, or, Who 'Invented' Socialist Realism?," in Lahusen and Dobrenko, *Socialist Realism*, 139–58. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 188–9, 195, 209. Régine Robin, "Popular Literature of the 1920s," in Fitzpatrick, Rabinowitch, and Stites, *Russia*, 264–5.

158. Bank and Vilenkin, *Krest'ianskaia molodezh'*, 75–6. Brylov, Veis, and Sakharov, *Pisatel'*, 69–81. Brylov et al., *Golos*, 10. Krylova et al., *Rabochie*, 99, 121. Toporov, *Krest'iane*, 33, 267–9.

159. Carleton, *Politics*, 129–33.

160. See Andrei Belyi, Veniamin Kaverin, and Mikhail Zoshchenko, in *Kak my pishem*, 19–20, 43–4, 61–2. See also Marietta Chudakova, "Sinii svet," in *Kak my pishem*, 189–90. Katerina Clark, "Little Heroes and Big Deeds," in Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Revolution*, 194–7. Dobrenko, *Formovka*, 47–8, 70–7.

161. Liubosh, "Literatura," 2–3. V. Pertsov, "Vymyshlennaia figura," 210–13. Trotskii, "A. Belyi," *Literatura*, 49–51. Voronskii, "O pisatele i chitatele"; "I. Babel'," *Litreaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 112–13, 274–5.

162. Eikhenbaum, "V ozhidanii," 280; "Metody," 13. Petrishchev, "Zabytaia godovshchina," 2.

163. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 88, 132. Zamiatin, "Genealogicheskoe derevo Uellsa," *My*, 603.

164. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 14.

165. Erenburg, "Novoe iskusstvo," 11. "Programma. Za chto boretsia LEF?," 6. Tret'iakov, "Tribuna," 160–1. See also Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 34–5.

166. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Literaturnaia Moskva" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 276–7.

167. Eikhenbaum, "'Moskva' Andreia Belogo" (1926), *O literature*, 424–6. Ol'ga Forsh, "Propetyi gerbarii," in Ivanov-Razumnik, *Sovremennaia literatura*, 31–2. Maiakovskii, "Nekrolog," 303. Shaginian, "Trevoga," in Shaginian and Averbakh, *Pisatel'*, 5–7. Tynianov, "O Khlebnikove" (1928), *Problema*, 293.

168. Rivera, "AkhRR," 43–4. See also Iaroslavskii, "Protiv levoi frazy," 31. Kurella, "Khudozhestvennaia reaktsiia," 42. "My dozhdemsia svoei kritiki!," 38, 42.

169. Levidov, "Organizovannoe uproshchenie," 306–18. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Zametki," 276–80.

170. Maguire, *Red Virgin Soil*, 17.

171. Fitzpatrick, *Commissariat*, 99–100. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 34–5. Griffin, *Modernism*, 175. Kling, "Evoliutsiia," 39. Mally, *Culture*, xviii–xx, 123–4.

172. Carleton, *Politics*, 111–17. Papazian, *Manufacturing Truth*, 175.

173. Mikhail Zoshchenko, "O sebe, o kritikakh i o svoei rabote"; Viktor Vinogradov, "Iazyk Zoshchenki," in Kazanskii and Tynianov, *Mastera*, 10–11, 73–5. See also Chudakova, "Skvoz' zvezdy k terniiam," *Literatura*, 341–2.

174. Eikhenbaum, "Leskov i sovremennaia proza" (1925), *O literature*, 420–2; "Illiuziia," 10–13; "V ozhidanii," 288. Vinogradov, "Problema skaza v stilistike" (1925), *O iazyke*, 53–4. See also Belaia, *Zakonomernosti*, 26–7; "Rozhdenie novykh stilevykh form kak protsess preodoleniia 'neitral'nogo' stilia," in Gei, *Mnogoobrazie*, 462–5; "Problema aktivnosti stiliia," in Kozhinov, *Smena*, 136.

175. Kruchenykh, *Zaumnyi iazyk*, 57–8. Mirskii, *Contemporary Russian Literature*, 231–2. Shklovskii, "O Zoshchenke i bol'shoi literature," in Kazanskii and Tynianov, *Mastera*, 17–18. Tynianov, "Literaturnoe segodnia" (1924), *Poetika*, 160.

176. Zoshchenko, "O sebe, o kritikakh i o svoei rabote," 8–9.

177. Carleton, *Politics*, 13, 107, 129–33.

178. See Gor'kii, "O proze"; "O iazyke," *O literature*, 116–25, 141–2. Kovarskii, "Spor," 108–20. Lunacharskii, "Desiat' knig za desiat' let revoliutsii" (1927), *Stat'i*, 229. Miller-Budnitskaia, "Ob 'Ulisse,'" 179. K. Chukovskii, I. Erenburg, L. Kassil', and A. Tolstoi, in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s''ezd*, 173, 181, 184–5, 416. *Istoriia russkoi literatury*, 10: 466–9. See also Katerina Clark, *Petersburg*, 284–94. Gorham, *Speaking*, 103–19, 135–8.

179. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Konets romana" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 203–4.

180. Carleton, *Politics*, 111–17, 130–1.

181. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 289.

182. Chukovskaia (13 June 1940), *Zapiski*, 1: 144. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 29.

183. Adamovich, "Chelovek v sovetskoi literature" (1931); "Tri p'esy" (1933), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 543, 2: 251; "Neznakomka," 16–17; "Nesostoiavshaiasia progulka," 295–6; "Literatura v SSSR," 185–7. See also Bëm, "Soblazn prostoty" (1934), *Issledovaniia*, 396–9. Gomolitskii, "Mif prostoty" (1939), *Sochineniia*, 3: 663–9.

184. Pasternak, "Liudi i polozheniia," *Vozdushnye puti*, 448. Veidle, "Pasternak," 156–7.

185. Berdiaev, *Filosofiia*, 145, 217, 226–7. See also Surette, *Dreams*, 9–13.

186. Toropetskii, "Povorot," 148–57.

187. Bëm, "O sovetskoi literature" (1933), *Issledovaniia*, 383–6. Georgii Fedotov, "Tragediia intelligentsii" (1926), in Maslin, *O Rossii*, 441. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 318–19.

188. Fel'zen, "My v Evrope" (1936), *Sobranie*, 2: 239–41. Gazdanov, "Literaturnye priznaniia," 259–61. Poplavskii, "Literaturnaia anketa," 287.

189. G. Ivanov, "V. Sirin," 233–5. Varshavskii, "V. Sirin. 'Podvig,'" 266–7.

190. Semën Frank, "De Profundis"; Pëtr Struve, "Istoricheskii smysl russkoi revoliutsii," in *Iz glubiny*, 291–2, 313–15. Prishvin (7 October 1928), *Dnevniki 1928–1929*,

277. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 117. Elena Tolstaia, "Mikhail Kuzmin i Aleksei Tolstoi," in Panova and Pratt, *Many Facets*, 199.

191. Berdiaev, "V zashchitu," 288–9. Rudnev, "Novyi Grad," 506–9. Stepun, "Po povodu," 316–20. Vishniak, "Opravdanie," 316–35; "Dve svobody," 334.

192. L. Andreev to V. Veresaev (April 1906), in Andreev and Beklemisheva, *Rekviem*, 163–4. Belyi, "Nikolai Il'ich Storozhenko," 67. Eikhenbaum (27 August 1917), "Dnevnik 1917–1918," 13. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 279–81, 343. Gorky to Andreev (15/18 March 1906), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 265–6. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Tri stupeni," *God*, 81. See also Figes and Kolonitskii, *Interpreting*, 122–4. Kassow, *Students*, 10–11, 402. Pipes, *Struve*, 14–15. Poltoratzky, "*Vekhi* Dispute," 99. Spivak, *Andrei Belyi*, 119. Stockdale, *Paul Miliukov*, 168–9.

193. Fel'zen, "My v Evrope" (1936); "Ravnodushie k svobode" (1936), *Sobranie*, 2: 237–47.

194. Ortega y Gasset, "The Dehumanization of Art," *Dehumanization*, 5–7. F. R. Leavis, *Mass Civilization*, 4–5, 18–19, 25. Q. D. Leavis, *Fiction*, 34–5, 38–9, 223–5, 231. Riding and Graves, *Survey*, 83–4.

195. Berdiaev, *Samopoznanie*, 154–5. Bitsilli, "Formula," 397–9; "Wladimir Weidlé," 471–2. Fedotov, "Sozdanie," 388–407. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 317–22.

196. Fitzpatrick, *Everyday Stalinism*, 15–16.

197. Fedotov, "Sozdanie," 391–2. Veidle, "Tri Rossii," 318–22. See also Bëm, "O sovetskoi literature," 382. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Sovetskaia literatura," in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 368. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 287.

198. Groys, *Total Art*, 5, 36, 51, 113. Karabchievskii, *Voskresenie*, 69.

199. Dobrenko, "Socialist Realism," 102–3. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 10, 156–61, 256.

200. Marietta Chudakova, "Utopiia Tynianova-kritika," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Shestye-Sed'mye-Vos'mye Tynianovskie chteniia*, 396. Dobrenko, "Socialist Realism," 110; "Funktsii i kategorii sotsrealisticheskoi kritiki," in Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 409–10. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 11. Günther, "Sotsrealizm i utopicheskoe myshlenie"; "Khudozhestvennyi avangard i sotsialisticheskii realizm," in Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 43, 107. Tihanov, "Why Did Modern Literary Theory," 66–7.

201. Günther, "Totalitarnoe iskusstvo kak sintez iskusstv," in Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 7. Griffin, *Modernism*, 286–7, 307–8.

202. Calinescu, "Modernism and Ideology," 83–86. Gentile, *Struggle*, 1, 44, 181. Griffin, *Modernism*, 170–5. North, *Political Aesthetic*, 2–7, 167. Potter, *Modernism*, 1, 184–6. D. Roberts, "Fascism," 91–102. Stromberg, *Redemption*, 179–98. Surette, *Dreams*, 4–5. For Russian examples, see Beer, *Renovating*, 201–9. Cohen, *Imagining*, 122. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 277–81. Groys, *Total Art*, 37; "Nietzsche's Influence on the Non-official Culture of the 1930s," in Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Nietzsche*, 63; "Totalitarizm karnavala," 77–80. Fitzpatrick, *Com-*

missariat, 121–2. Hellman, *Poets*, 1, 28–31, 307–32. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 2–7, 209–27. Saianov, "K voprosu o sud'bakh akmeizma," 114–16. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 17, 38. Tihanov, *Master*, 66.

203. Chudakova, "Utopiia Tynianova-kritika," 389–95. Dobrenko, *Aesthetics*, xvi. Gibian, introduction to Gibian and Tjalsma, *Russian Modernism*, 14. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 11, 31–5. Groys, *Total Art*, 8–9. Günther, "Khudozhestvennyi avangard i sotsialisticheskii realizm," 101. Bernice Glatzer Rosenthal, *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky*, 224–6.

204. Berdiaev, *Filosofiia*, 113–16, 138; *Samopoznanie*, 52, 213; and in Glavatskii, *"Filosofskii parokhod,"* 166–7. Aleksandr Blok, "Iunosheskii dnevnik," 311–12. Gorky to A. Volynskii (December 1897), in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 360–1; and to Lenin (11–16 January 1919), in Keldysh, Barakhov, and Zaika, *Neizvestnyi Gor'kii*, 26–27. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Svoe litso"; "Tri stupeni," *God*, 78–9, 81–2. Khodasevich, "Briusov"; letters to B. Sadovskoi (15 December 1917; 3 April 1919; 10 February 1920), *Nekropol'*, 47, 359–64. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 306–7. Minskii, *Religiia*, 280–84. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 91–4.

205. Crow, "Modernism and Mass Culture in the Visual Arts," in Buchloh, Guilbaut, and Solkin, *Modernism*, 254–6.

206. Günther, "LEF i sovetskaia kul'tura," in Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 244. Gutkin, *Cultural Origins*, 150–51.

207. Dobrenko, "The Disaster of Middlebrow Taste," in Lahusen and Dobrenko, *Socialist Realism*, 160.

208. Aleksandr Blok, "Krushenie gumanizma" (1919), *Sobranie*, 6: 113.

Chapter 5. Russian Modernism in the Cultural Market

1. Charle, *Intellectuels*, 165–9.

2. Merezhkovskii, "O prichinakh upadka i o novykh techeniiakh sovremennoi russkoi literatury," *Izbrannye stat'i*, 225–7. See also Kornei Chukovskii, "Spasite!" (1907), *Sobranie*, 6: 486–8. Minskii, *Religiia*, 281–4. Tarlanov, "Sotsial'nyi tip," 43–56.

3. Pippin, *Modernism*, 32. Walker, *Maximilian Voloshin*, 6–15.

4. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 203–6; 2: 36–7. Avrelii [Briusov], "Svoboda," 62–5. N. Mikhailovskii, "Russkoe otrazhenie frantsuzskogo simvolizma" (1893), *Literaturnaia kritika*, 349–50. Minskii, "Sotsial-gumanizm," *Na obshchestvennye temy*, 62–72. Trotskii, "Intelligentsiia i revoliutsiia" (1910), *Literatura*, 357.

5. Perry Anderson, "Modernity and Revolution," in Nelson and Grossberg, *Marxism*, 325.

6. Bourdieu, "The Market of Symbolic Goods," *Field*, 113–27. See also Hobsbawm, *Age*, 261–2. Lahire, *Franz Kafka*, 9–34. Rowland, *Literature*, 173, 187, 191.

7. Cooper, *Modernism*, 4–5.

8. Rainey, *Institutions*, 2–3, 39–41.

9. Strychacz, *Modernism*, 5–6, 26–8.

10. Gluck, *Popular Bohemia*, vii, 2–6.

11. Reitblat, "'<. . .> chto blestit'?," 249–51.

12. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1930), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 86.

13. Kornei Chukovskii, "Tema deneg v tvorchestve Nekrasova" (1921), *Liudi*, 264–72.

14. Eikhenbaum, "Literaturnyi byt" (1929), *"Moi vremennik,"* 62, 70.

15. Lotman, "Russkaia literatura poslepetrovskoi epokhi i khristianskaia traditsiia," *Iu. M. Lotman*, 365–79; "Literaturnaia biografiia v istoriko-kul'turnom kontekste," *Izbrannye stat'i*, 1: 365–76. Paperno, *Chernyshevsky*, 204.

16. Graña, *Bohemian*, 52–7. Martin-Fugier, *Romantiques*, 230–2. Charles Russell, "The Context of the Concept," in Garvin, *Romanticism*, 185.

17. Art Berman, *Preface*, ix.

18. Menand, *Discovering*, 99–117. Wexler, *Who Paid*, xii–xv, 123.

19. Delany, *Literature*, 111, 147–8. Timothy Materer, "Make It Sell!," in Dettmar and Watt, *Marketing*, 17–20. Steve Smith and Catriona Kelly, "Commercial Culture and Consumerism," in Kelly and Shepherd, *Constructing*, 139. Joyce Wexler, "Selling Sex as Art," in Dettmar and Watt, *Marketing*, 91.

20. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nat Pinkerton i sovremennaia literatura" (1908), *Kniga*, 43–4. For a similar comparison (Tolstoy and Verbitskaia), see Merezhkovskii, "Nesolenaia sol'," *Bylo*, 229–33.

21. Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia*, 4, 109–16, 295.

22. Abram Reitblat, "Vzaimootnosheniia avtorov i izdatelei," in Frolova, *Kniga*, 441–2.

23. Kornei Chukovskii, "Tema deneg v tvorchestve Nekrasova," 264–77. Eikhenbaum, "Literatura i pisatel'," *"Moi Vremennik,"* 88–92. Makeev, *Nikolai Nekrasov*, passim. Senelick, "Money," 327–30.

24. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 76–7. Prishvin, "Okhota za schast'em," *Sobranie*, 3: 13–18.

25. Reitblat, "Vzaimootnosheniia avtorov i izdatelei," 442–5; "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," in Bagno, Malmstad, and Malikova, *Na rubezhe*, 596–7. See also Jeffrey Brooks, "Popular Philistinism and the Course of Russian Modernism," in Morson, *Literature*, 106.

26. N. Mikhailovskii, "Russkoe otrazhenie frantsuzskogo simvolizma," 349–50.

27. N. Mikhailovskii, "O povestiakh i rasskazakh gg. Gor'kogo i Chekhova" (1902), *Literaturnaia kritika*, 495–6.

28. Gorky to Andreev (21 October 1911; see also 12 September 1907; 1/13 March 1908), in their *Neizdannaia perepiska*, 296–7, 305, 318–19.

29. A. Pogosova, "Pis'ma M. Gor'kogo A. L. Volynskomu i v redaktsiiu zhurnala

'Severnyi vestnik,'" in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 360–3. Reitblat, "Vzaimootnosheniia avtorov i izdatelei"; M. Svichenskaia, "Izdatel'stvo 'Znanie,'" in Frolova, *Kniga*, 149–55, 442–3.

30. Reitblat, "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," 596–7.

31. Kornei Chukovskii, "Spasite!," 486–8. See also McReynolds, *News*, 162–6.

32. Gumilev, "Pis'mo," 123–4.

33. Rozanov, "Opavshie list'ia. Korob vtoroi" (1915), *Mysli*, 333–4, 341.

34. Briusov (24 July 1904), *Dnevniki. Avtobiograficheskaia proza*, 302.

35. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 10–11.

36. Louise McReynolds, "V. M. Doroshevich," in Clowes, Kassow, and James, *Between Tsar*, 236–47; *News*, 145–9.

37. Kornei Chukovskii (22 March 1922), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 199.

38. Belyi to Ivanov-Razumnik (10 June 1916), in their *Perepiska*, 68. Tolstaia, *Bednyi rytsar'*, 389–91.

39. V. Briusov to F. Sologub (16 October 1907; October 1907, n.d.), "Pis'ma k F. Sologubu," 112–13.

40. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 171.

41. Georgii Ivanov, "Stikhi," 60.

42. Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia*, 333, 355–6.

43. Reitblat, "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," 597–8.

44. Filosofov, "Novye izdaniia," 153.

45. See Sofia Dymshits-Tolstaia's memoirs, in Tolstaia, *Kliuchi schast'ia*, 190–2.

46. Eikhenbaum, "Literatura i pisatel'," 72. Pyman, *History of Russian Symbolism*, 160–8. Reitblat, "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," 600–2; "Vzaimootnosheniia avtorov i izdatelei," 448.

47. Ellis, "Literaturnyi nevod," 81. D. Sherikh, "Izdatel'stvo 'Shipovnik'"; Svichenskaia, "Izdatel'stvo 'Znanie,'" 152–5, 165–6.

48. A. Nikolaev, "Vikentii Pashukanis," in Reznichenko, *Knigoizdatel'stvo*, 178–82.

49. Sobolev, "K istorii zhurnala 'Trudy i dni.' Reestr podpischikov," *Turgenev*, 636–99. Khodasevich's letter to B. Sadovskoi (10 June 1913) is cited in the same article (645).

50. Pound, "Small Magazines," 702.

51. Reitblat, "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," 603–6; "Izdatel'stva novogo tipa"; "Vzaimootnosheniia avtorov i izdatelei," in Frolova, *Kniga*, 233–42, 268, 445–6.

52. Dinershtein, *Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin*, 150.

53. A. Belyi to Ellis (February 1908), in Lavrov, *Andrei Belyi*, 420.

54. Dinershtein, *Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin*, 148–50.

55. Belyi to Blok (15–16 November 1911), E. Metner (29 September 1911), and A. Rachinskaia (1 December 1911), in Belyi and Blok, *Perepiska*, 420n4, 420n9, 426. See also Leonid Dolgopolov, "Tvorcheskaia istoriia i istoriko-literaturnoe znachenie romana A. Belogo 'Peterburg,'" in Belyi, *Peterburg*, 547–58.

56. Delany, *Literature*, 145. Cedric Watts, "Marketing Modernism," in Willison, Gould, and Cherniak, *Modernist Writers*, 82–3, 87.

57. Blok to D. Filosofov (2 October 1909), "Iz epistoliarnogo naslediia Alesandra Bloka," in Lavrov and Grechishkin, *Simvolisty vblizi*, 283–4. McReynolds, "V. M. Doroshevich," 239. Reitblat, "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," 606. For another example, see V. Gofman (6 January 1910), "Pis'ma V. V. Gofmana k A. A. Shemshurinu," ed. Lavrov, in Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 273.

58. Belyi to Blok (4 November 1911; 9–10 November 1911), in their *Perepiska*, 422, 424.

59. Belyi to Ellis (February 1908), in Lavrov, *Andrei Belyi*, 420. Belyi, "Detskaia svistul'ka," 58. See also Ellis to Briusov (17 September 1907), in Lavrov, "Ellis v 'Vesakh'" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 312).

60. Eikhenbaum, "Pisatel'skii oblik M. Gor'kogo," *"Moi vremennik,"* 121–3.

61. Kornei Chukovskii, "O Leonide Andreeve," *Litsa*, 61–2.

62. Beth Holmgren, "Gendering the Icon," in Goscilo and Holmgren, *Russia*, 327–8.

63. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 27. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1933); "Zapisi 1950-1960-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 120, 214. See also Lekmanov, *Zhizn'*, 9–10. Loewen, *Most Dangerous Art*, 94–5.

64. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1930s), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 137.

65. Alexander Zholkovsky, "The Obverse of Stalinism," in Engelstein and Sandler, *Self and Story*, 51.

66. Tsvetaeva, "Poet," 112–13.

67. Auslender, "Iz Peterburga," 65–7. Belyi, "Shtempelevannaia kalosha," 49–52. Ellis, "Nashi epigony," 65–6. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nat Pinkerton i sovremennaia literatura," 42, 60–3; "Peterburgskie teatry," 75. See also Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia*, 154–6. Reitblat, "Izdatel'stva novogo tipa," 230–1.

68. Minskii, *Religiia*, 280–4.

69. Ellis, "Krizis," 63–5. See also Ellis, "Eshche odna korona," 63. "Pchely i osy Apollona. Skuchnyi razgovor," 84.

70. Chukovskaia (8 June 1940), *Zapiski*, 1: 136–7. Kornei Chukovskii (March 1968), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 427–8.

71. Sologub, *Tvorimaia legenda*, 105.

72. Kornei Chukovskii (April 1924), in Nikolai Chukovskii, *O tom*, 381–2.

73. Bal'mont (30 August/12 November 1907), in Briusov, "Perepiska s K. D. Bal'montom," 188.

74. Remizov, "Pisatel'," *Izbrannoe*, 287–9.

75. D. Burliuk et al., "Poshchechina obshchestvennomu vkusu" (1912), in Markov, *Manifesty*, 51. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 65.

76. "Programma. Za chto boretsia LEF?," 3. Maiakovskii, "Nekrolog," 303. See also Cohen, *Imagining*, 121, 183. Dobrenko, *Formovka*, 65–6. Karabchievskii, *Voskresenie*, 63.

77. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 196. Markov, *Russian Futurism*, 277–8. Bela Prilezhaeva-Barskaia, "Brodiachaia sobaka," in Timenchik, *Chto vdrug*, 181–2, 224n76. Sventitskii, "Bolezn′," 8.

78. Conroy, *In Health*, 100–5. Shklovskii, *Poiski*, 86.

79. Belyi, "Shtempelevannaia kul′tura," 72–80. Kuzmin (23–24 September 1934), *Dnevnik 1934 goda*, 110. Metner, "Estrada" (1908), *Modernizm*, 77–108. See also Paperni, "Bibliia," 166–78. Serman, "Spory," 167–9. Spivak, *Andrei Belyi*, 332–3.

80. 22 October 1910 (Blok); October 1910 (Belyi); 17/18 January 1912 (Belyi); 15 November 1912 (Blok), in their *Perepiska*, 374–6, 435–6, 474. See also Aleksandr Blok (30 December 1911; 17 October 1912), *Dnevnik*, 91, 101, 142.

81. Bliumbaum, "Loci Communes," 242–67. See also Shteinberg, *Druz′ia*, 40–2.

82. Aleksandr Blok, "Voprosy," 66; "Iunosheskii dnevnik," 311–12.

83. McReynolds, *News*, 153.

84. Bal′mont (13 April 1930), *Konstantin Bal′mont—Ivanu Shmelevu*, 200.

85. Cohen, *Imagining*, 47–9.

86. Chekhov to Suvorin (18 May 1891), *Polnoe sobranie* (*Pis′ma*), 4: 233.

87. Livak, *Jewish Persona*, 281–99, 359–61.

88. Belyi, "Iz 'Vospominanii' "; letter to E. Metner (26 December 1912), in "Dopolneniia," *Peterburg*, 506, 513; letter to Blok (17–18 January 1912), in their *Perepiska*, 435–6.

89. Belyi (March 1913), *"Liubliu tebia nezhno,"* 176. Ivanov-Razumnik to Belyi (26 March 1916), in their *Perepiska*, 65, 66n2. Dolgopolov, "Tvorcheskaia istoriia," 547–8. Zamiatin, "Andrei Belyi" (1934), *My*, 609–10.

90. Kornei Chukovskii, "Nat Pinkerton i sovremennaia literatura," 65–6.

91. Reitblat, "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," 604. This observation finds support in Roger Keys's bibliography of modernist fiction (*Reluctant Modernist*, 235–8).

92. On the print runs and prices of modernist books of verse, see L. M. Turchinskii, *Russkie poety XX veka*.

93. See Sologub's negotiations concerning the proposed publication of his book of verse with the Skorpion imprint (2 November 1901, 15 December 1901, 14 January 1903, 17 December 1903, 4 April 1904), "Pis′ma Fëdora Sologuba V. Ia. Briusovu," in Sobolev, *Leteiskaia biblioteka*, 2: 327–35.

94. Filosofov, "Novye izdaniia 'Skorpiona,' " 153. Georgii Ivanov (24 March 1956), in Ivanov and Odoevtseva, *Briefe*, 20–1. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 7. Luknitskii, *Vstrechi*, 252. Shklovskii, *Poiski*, 99. See also Lekmanov, *Zhizn′*, 51. Reitblat, "Simvolisty, ikh izdateli i chitateli," 599. Nikolaev, "Vikentii Pashukanis," 180, 186–8.

95. Lavrov, "Briusov i Ivan Konevskoi," *Russkie simvolisty*, 100. Shklovskii, *Zhili-byli*, *Gamburgskii schet*, 412.

96. Peterson, *History*, 50.

97. Aleksandr Blok (23 February 1913), *Dnevnik*, 1: 185–6.

98. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 212–13.

99. "Massovye ezhenedel'niki dlia 'pestrogo' chitatelia," in Bialik, Keldysh, and Shcherbina, *Literaturnyi protsess*, 281.

100. Jeffrey Brooks, *When Russia*, 4, 109–16, 295. McReynolds, *News*, 113–17. Maksimov, "Novyi put'," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 233–4.

101. G. Ivanov, "Stikhi," 60. On the inability of the "thick journals" to compete with almanacs, see the correspondence of Sologub (30 November 1910, 12 December 1910) and Briusov (9 December 1910, 18 December 1910), "Pis'ma Fëdora Sologuba V. Ia. Briusovu," in Sobolev, *Leteiskaia biblioteka*, 2: 357–9.

102. Briusov (4 September 1910), "Pis'ma k F. Sologubu," 118. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 10–11.

103. Aleksandrovich, *Posle Chekhova*, 1: 199, 203–6. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 3–4. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 71–4. Reitblat, "Vzaimootnosheniia avtorov i izdatelei," 149–51. Svichenskaia, "Izdatel'stvo 'Znanie,'" 443–4.

104. Joan Grossman, "Rise and Decline of the 'Literary' Journal," in Martinsen, *Literary Journals*, 171–93.

105. Peter Brooker and Andrew Thacker, general introduction to *Oxford Critical and Cultural History*, 1: 1–26. Cottington, *Avant-Garde*, 15–16. Elizabeth Miller, *Slow Print*, 2–8, 300–1. Thibaudet, *Histoire*, 492.

106. Rainey, *Institutions*, 107–8.

107. Stanley Rabinowitz, "Northern Herald," in Martinsen, *Literary Journals*, 207–27.

108. "Modernistskie izdaniia. 'Severnyi vestnik,'" in Bialik, Keldysh, and Shcherbina, *Literaturnyi protsess*, 101–2.

109. Liubov' Gurevich, "Istoriia 'Severnogo vestnika,'" in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 1: 241–59. On *Niva*, see "Massovye ezhenedel'niki dlia 'pestrogo' chitatelia," in Bialik, Keldysh, and Shcherbina, *Literaturnyi protsess*, 281.

110. Rabinowitz, "Room of His Own," 299–300.

111. Briusov, "Poety-realisty. II. Ivan Bunin" (1907), in *Dalekie*, 155. Minskii, "Sotsial-gumanizm," in *Na obshchestvennye temy*, 62–72.

112. Gurevich, "Istoriia 'Severnogo vestnika,'" 260. Gurevich to E. Mesching (1 May 1898), in Pavlova, "Etot preslovutyi plevok," 129. N. Minskii (15 December 1894) and F. Sologub (7 May 1896) to L. Gurevich, in Maksimov, "'Severnyi vestnik' i simvolisty" (Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 107–9). P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 230.

113. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 162–3, 167.

114. Maksimov, "Novyi put'," in Evgen'ev-Maksimov and Maksimov, *Iz proshlogo*, 234–6.

115. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 230.

116. William Harkins, "The Literary Content of 'The World of Art,'" in Martinsen, *Literary Journals*, 203–4.

117. F. Lur'e, *Mir iskusstva*, 22–4.

118. V. Briusov (31 August 1907), "Pis'ma k F. Sologubu," 110–11. Oleg Minin, "Modernism Upheld," in Brooker and Thacker, *Oxford Critical and Cultural History*, 3.2: 1284–86.

119. Belyi to Blok (18 January 1912), in their *Perepiska*, 283. V. Briusov (1 October 1906), "Letters of V. Ja. Brjusov," 72. V. Briusov (4 March 1906) and K. Chukovskii (12 March 1906), in Kornei Chukovskii, *Sobranie*, 14: 85–7. D. Mirskii to P. Suvchinskii (27 February 1927), *Letters of D. S. Mirsky*, 76–7.

120. "Mir iskusstva," in Bialik, Keldysh, and Shcherbina, *Literaturnyi protsess*, 152.

121. Sologub (7 June 1904), "Pis'ma Fëdora Sologuba V. Ia. Briusovu," in Sobolev, *Leteiskaia biblioteka*, 2: 335. See also M. Pavlova, "Tvorcheskaia istoriia romana 'Melkii bes,'" in Sologub, *Melkii bes*, 738–40.

122. Briusov (5 July 1907), "Pis'ma k F. Sologubu," 108–9.

123. Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.1: 78.

124. P. Pertsov, *Literaturnye vospominaniia*, 182, 212.

125. Smith and Kelly, "Commercial Culture and Consumerism," 140.

126. Keys, "Symbolist Fiction: A Selected Bibliography, 1895–1914," *Reluctant Modernist*, 235–8.

127. For Belyi's critical reflection foreshadowing *Petersburg*, see "Prorok bezlichiia" (1908), *Arabeski*, 4–6. On Russian modernist attitudes toward the classical novel, see Leonid Livak, "Russian Modernism and the Novel," in Castle, *History*, 110–34.

128. For a discussion of the author's dire financial straits as the impetus for his *Petersburg* project, see Belyi to Blok (15–16 November 1911), E. Metner (29 September 1911), and A. Rachinskaia (1 December 1911), in Belyi and Blok, *Perepiska*, 420n4, 420n9, 426; Belyi to E. Metner (26 December 1912), in L. Dolgopolov, "Dopolneniia" (Belyi, *Peterburg*, 513).

129. Philip Horne, "Henry James and the Economy of the Short Story," in Willison, Gould, and Cherniak, *Modernist Writers*, 3, 9. See also Louis Menand, "Kipling in the History of Forms," in DiBattista and McDiarmid, *High and Low Moderns*, 153–4.

130. Armstrong, *Modernism*, 52–3.

131. Delany, *Literature*, 119–21.

132. Izmailov, *Pomrachenie*, 212–13.

133. Ellis, "Nashi epigony," 62.

134. Eikhenbaum, "Roman ili biografiia" (1913), *O literature*, 288–9.

135. Belyi, "Literatura i krizis zhizni" (1925), in Bogomolov, *Russkaia literatura*, 476–7. Kornei Chukovskii (28 June 1920), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 146. Eikhenbaum, *Molodoi Tolstoi* (1922); "O Shatobriane, o chervontsakh i russkoi literature" (1924), *O literature*, 35, 367; "Illiuziia," 10–13. Fedotov, "Bor'ba," 33, 37. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Konets romana" (1922), *Sochineniia*, 2: 204. See also Caryl Emerson, "Theory," in Jones and Miller, *Cambridge Companion*, 276–9.

136. Levenson, *Modernism*, 55–6; *Genealogy*, viii.

137. Aldanov, "O romane," 433–5. Bitsilli, "Venok," 166–73. Eikhenbaum, "Zam-

etki i razmyshleniia," *"Moi Vremennik,"* 137. Mochul'skii, "Krizis," 76–81. Vinaver, "Ugolovnyi roman," 257–8.

138. M. H. Abrams, *Mirror*, 21–7.

139. Kornei Chukovskii (25 March 1966), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 385.

140. Briusov, "Viacheslav Ivanov. Kormchie zvezdy" (1903/1911), *Dalekie*, 116–18. P. Mitrofanov, "Innokentii Annenskii," in Vengerov, *Russkaia literatura*, 2: 296.

141. Viach. Ivanov, "Mysli," 7.

142. Bogomolov, "Proekt 'Akmeizm,'" 156. Gorodetskii, "Nekotorye techeniia," 48. Mochul'skii, "Klassitsizm," 376–7.

143. Belyi, "Detskaia svistul'ka," 56; "Teoriia," 39–40. See also Pustygina, "K izucheniiu evoliutsii," 145–6.

144. Chudovskii, "Russkaia mysl'," 73.

145. For the Formalist acknowledgment of intellectual debt to early modernist theory, see Eikhenbaum, "K voprosu o zvukakh iazyka" (1916), *O literature*, 235. Jakobson, "Budetlianin nauki," in Jangfeldt, *Iakobson*, 15. Zhirmunskii, "Zadachi poetiki," *Teoriia*, 15–16; "Po povodu," 203. On Formalism's early modernist roots, see Adamovich, "Novaia kniga Andreia Belogo," *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 287. Asmus, "Filosofiia," 2–3. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 295. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Vzgliad i nechto," in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 2: 539–43. Lelevich, "Mezhdu formalizmom," 176. Medvedev, "Uchenyi sal'erizm," 264–75. Otsup, "Ob Andree Belom," 214. See also Depretto, *Formalisme*, 82, 213. Gindin, "Pervyi konflikt," 65–8. Hansen-Löve, *Russkii formalizm*, 36–7, 548–9. A. Miasnikov, "U istokov 'formal'noi shkoly,'" in Bialik, *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii*, 340.

146. Eikhenbaum, "Metody," 13–14; "Teoriia 'formal'nogo' metoda," *O literature*, 379; "Zhizn' ushla v storonu ot formalizma," *"Moi Vremennik,"* 583–4. Jakobson, *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*, 11.

147. On the biographical and aesthetic links of Formalists to the Cubo-Futurist faction, and to modernist culture more generally, see Eikhenbaum, "K voprosu o zvukakh iazyka," 236; "Slovesnost'," *"Moi Vremennik,"* 52–4. Jakobson, "From Alyagrov's Letters," in Jackson and Rudy, *Russian Formalism*, 1–5; "Budetlianin nauki," 15–16, 21, 64. Khodasevich, "Dekol'tirovannaia loshad'" (1927), *Nekropol'*, 220. Livshits, *Polutoraglazyi strelets*, 156–8. Medvedev, *Formalizm*, 52–6. Shklovskii, "Beseda o proletarskoi kul'ture," in Belous, *Vol'fila*, 1: 225–6. See also Depretto, *Formalisme*, 201–4. Galushkin, "Viktor Shklovskii v 1913 godu," in Jaccard and Morard, *1913*, 204–11. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*, 2: 287. Markov, "Mysli," 180. Pomorska, *Russian Formalist Theory*, 119. Peter Steiner, *Russian Formalism*, 143–4, 154–5. M. Umnova, "Avangardnye ustanovki v sisteme idei Opoiaza"; S. Sukhoparov, "Roman Iakobson i Aleksei Kruchenykh," in Gindin, Grintser, and Shumilova, *Materialy*, 192–3, 213–14. Veresova, *V nachale*, 28–9.

148. Ginzburg, "Zapisi, sviazannye s zapisnoi knizhkoi 1943," *Prokhodiashchie kharaktery*, 205; "Zapisnye knizhki" (1925–26); "Problema povedeniia (B. M. Eikhen-

baum)," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 26, 442. See also Aage Hansen-Löve, "Le Formalisme russe," in Etkind et al., *Histoire*, 2: 654–5. Chudakova, "Utopiia Tynianova-kritika," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Shestye-Sed'mye-Vos'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 395.

149. Eikhenbaum (2 December 1925; 15 December 1925), cited in Chudakova, "Sotsial'naia praktika, filologicheskaia refleksiia i literatura v nauchnoi biografii Eikhenbauma i Tynianova," *Literatura*, 438. See also Katerina Clark, "The 'Quiet Revolution' in Soviet Intellectual Life," in Fitzpatrick, Rabinowitch, and Stites, *Russia*, 223.

150. Eikhenbaum, "O Viktore Shklovskom," *"Moi Vremennik,"* 136–7.

151. See Eikhenbaum's diary (7 March 1928), in Chudakova, "Sotsial'naia praktika," 441. O. Eikhenbaum, "Iz vospominanii"; R. Jakobson, "Boris Mikhailovich Eikhenbaum," in Eikhenbaum, *"Moi vremennik,"* 603, 626–7.

152. Chudakova, "Sotsial'naia praktika," 447. Depretto, *Formalisme*, 292. Grigor'eva, *Anima*, 54, 107. Andrew Wachtel, "Zamechaniia o vzaimootnoshenii khudozhestvennykh i nauchnykh proizvedenii Tynianova," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 222, 229–30.

153. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970-1980-kh godov," 358–9.

154. Tillyard, *Impact*, 1–40.

155. Byford, *Literary Scholarship*, 142–3.

156. Shklovskii, *Tret'ia fabrika* (1926), *Gamburgskii schet*, 120–2.

157. Hansen-Löve, *Russkii formalizm*, 394.

158. Eikhenbaum, "Literaturnyi byt," 64. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1928), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 66.

159. Blium, *Za kulisami*, 36–44.

160. Kornei Chukovskii (4 September 1925), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 349–50. Maguire, *Red Virgin Soil*, 384–8.

161. Shklovskii, *Tekhnika*, 3–15. See also Eikhenbaum, "Literatura i pisatel'," 70, 89–92.

162. Bulgakov (26 October 1923), in Bulgakov and Bulgakova, *Dnevnik*, 34. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 16, 93, 101. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 334, 346–9. See also Maguire, *Red Virgin Soil*, 389–91.

163. Vaginov, *Kozlinaia pesn', Polnoe sobranie*, 75.

164. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1925–6), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 35. Karen Rosenberg, "The Concept of Originality in Formalist Theory," in Jackson and Rudy, *Russian Formalism*, 163–5.

165. Shklovskii, "Gamburgskii schet" (1928), *Gamburgskii schet*, 152.

166. Kornei Chukovskii to I. Repin (2 February 1924), *Sobranie*, 14: 563; and to N. Chukovskii (23 June 1924), in N. Chukovskii, *O tom*, 385. Kornei Chukovskii (25 December 1925), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 354.

167. Eikhenbaum, "V ozhidanii," 280–1; "Literaturnyi byt," 62–4.

168. Tynianov, "Promezhutok" (1924), *Poetika*, 168.

169. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1925–6), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 26. Vinokur, "Russ-

kaia poetika i ee dostizheniia" (1924), *Filologicheskie issledovaniia*, 67–8. Zhirmunskii, "K voprosu o formal'nom metode" (1923), *Teoriia*, 95–6.

170. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1925–6), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 31. Viktor Shklovskii, "Ot redaktsii," in Grits, Trenin, and Nikitin, *Slovesnost'*, 5.

171. Shklovskii, *Tekhnika*, 6, 12.

172. Shklovskii, "Gamburgskii schet," 179. See also Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1928), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 57.

173. Eikhenbaum, "Literaturnyi byt," 61–4. See also Hansen-Löve, *Russkii formalizm*, 393.

174. Shklovskii, *Tret'ia fabrika*, 88–9, 105, 112, 120.

175. Eikhenbaum, "Literaturnyi byt"; "Literatura i pisatel'," 68–92. See also Grits, Trenin, and Nikitin, *Slovesnost' i kommertsiia*.

176. Levidov, "Organizovannoe uproshchenie," 306–18. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Zametki," 276–80.

177. Eikhenbaum, "Literatura i pisatel'"; "Pisatel'skii oblik M. Gor'kogo," 72, 122.

178. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1930), *Zapisnye knizki*, 89.

179. Adamovich, "'Poiski optimizma' V. Shklovskogo," in *Literaturnye zametki*, 2: 81. Kornei Chukovskii, "Bol'nichnye zapiski" (May 1968), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 406. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Armiia poetov," 33: 12; 34: 13–16.

180. Tynianov, "Literaturnoe segodnia" (1924), *Poetika*, 166.

181. Kornei Chukovskii (1 January 1922), *Sobranie*, 12: 6. See also John Malmstad, "Khodasevich and Formalism," in Jackson and Rudy, *Russian Formalism*, 75–6.

182. I. Shmelëv to I. Il'in (25 October 1932; 10 May 1933), *Perepiska dvukh Ivanov*, 325, 386–8. See also Georgii Chulkov's diary (5 April 1938), in Griakalova, "Otkrovennye mysli" (Bystrov, Griakalova, and Lavrov, *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*, 477).

183. E. Gollerbakh, "Zhizn' A. L. Volynskogo," in Medvedev, *Pamiati*, 15–16, 25–6.

184. Levinton, "Jakobsoniana," 567. Hugh McLean, "Roman Jakobson, A Memoir," in Ustinov, *Vademecum*, 649–50.

185. O. Eikhenbaum, "Iz vospominanii"; V. Shubinskii, "Zheleznyi kuznechik"; B. Eikhenbaum, "Slovesnost'," in Eikhenbaum, *"Moi Vremennik,"* 8–9, 47–51, 613–14.

186. Shklovskii, *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*, 81, 125, 167–8, 201, 230–31; *Poiski*, 103–4.

187. Kornei Chukovskii (20 May 1967), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 390. Depretto, *Formalisme*, 298–300. Ginzburg, "Zapisi, ne opublikovannye pri zhizni" (1925–26), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 373. Iu. Oksman to K. Chukovskii (1–3 July 1961), in their *Perepiska*, 112–13. T. Veresova, "Dve rodstvennye sem'i," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 371–3. Zhirmunskaia, "Zhirmunskii," 368.

188. Ginzburg, "Zapisi, ne opublikovannye pri zhizni," 386–7, 391–3, 401, 428. For an example of the discourse about the Jewish takeover of universities, see Prishvin (29 November 1924), *Dnevniki 1923–1925*, 189.

189. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1988), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 339–41.

190. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1925–26), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 16.

191. Pasternak, *Okhrannaia gramota* (1931), *Vozdushnye puti*, 272–3.

192. Grossman-Roshchin, "Sotsial'nyi zamysel," 119. Maiakovskii and Brik, "Nasha slovesnaia rabota," 40–1. See also Loewen, *Most Dangerous Art*, 41–4. Graham Roberts, *Last Soviet Avant-Garde*, 2, 23–30.

193. For the Marxist dismissal of modernist charismatic self-stylization, see Kogan, *Ocherki*, 3.3: 113–14. Trotskii, "Vneoktiabr'skaia literatura," *Literatura*, 30.

194. Chuzhak, "Ob etoi knige i ob nas," *Literatura fakta*, 5. On the association of professionalism with aesthetic and social stratification, see Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki" (1943), *Zapisnye knizhki*, 173–4, 176–7.

195. Adamovich, "O polozhenii," 296–8.

196. Delany, *Literature*, 149.

197. Calder, *Robert Louis Stevenson*, 172.

198. Belyi to Blok (15–16 November 1911; 19 November 1911), in their *Perepiska*, 427–8. Blok to D. Filosofov (2 October 1909), "Iz epistoliarnogo naslediia Alesandra Bloka," in Lavrov and Grechishkin, *Simvolisty vblizi*, 283–4. Rainey, *Institutions*, 74–5, 107–8.

199. Berdiaev, *Krizis*, 5, 19–20. Lunts, "Pochemu," 31. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 25. Slonim, "Serapionovy brat'ia," 48. Trotskii, "Serapionovy brat'ia"; "Formal'naia shkola poezii i marksizm," *Literatura*, 65, 130, 142. See also McLean, "Development," 406. Shepherd, *Beyond Metafiction*, 17–18.

200. Emily Finer, "A Rift on the Left Front?," in Brooker and Thacker, *Oxford Critical and Cultural History*, 3.2: 1335–7.

201. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 55, 61.

202. Silverman, *Art Nouveau*, 12, 173–4.

203. Fitzpatrick, *Tear Off the Masks!*, 182–90.

204. Osip Mandel'shtam, "Slovo," 82–4.

205. Walker, "*Kruzhok*," 107–9, 123; *Maximilian Voloshin*, 118–19, 154–5.

206. Khodasevich (28 June 1923), *Sobranie*, 4: 460–1. Malmstad, "Khodasevich and Formalism," 71–2.

207. Liubosh, "Literatura," 3.

208. Mirskii, "O nyneshnem sostoianii," 92.

209. Kornei Chukovskii (15 October 1918; 9 July 1919), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 93, 114.

210. Glavatskii, *"Filosofskii parokhod,"* 166–7.

211. Katerina Clark, *Petersburg*, 287. Walker, "*Kruzhok*," 121–2.

212. Fitzpatrick, *Commissariat*, xv.

213. Charles Rougle, "The Intelligentsia Debate in Russia 1917–1918," in Nilsson, *Art*, 76–9.

214. Brik, "Neumestnoe politikanstvo," 29. See also Cohen, *Imagining*, 149–52.

Bengt Jangfeldt, "Russian Futurism 1917–1919," in Nilsson, *Art*, 107–13; *Stavka*, 110–11. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*, 2.1: 9–25.

215. Jangfeldt, *Stavka*, 175.

216. Brik, "Khudozhnik-proletarii," 1. Punin, "O forme," 1. "Programma. Za chto boretsia LEF?," 3–4. See also Günther, "LEF i sovetskaia kul'tura," in Günther and Dobrenko, *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*, 244–7.

217. Cohen, *Imagining*, 171–5, 184. Fitzpatrick, *Commissariat*, 120–1. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 31–2. Jangfeldt, "Russian Futurism 1917–1919," 114–19. Krusanov, *Russkii avangard*, 2.1: 38–41; *Futuristicheskaia revoliutsiia*, 2: 480, 483.

218. On Pound's project, see Perl, *Tradition*, 262–4. Rainey, *Institutions*, 108–9. Moody, *Ezra Pound*, 2: 54–5, 100–3. On Maiakovskii's talk with Marinetti, see Katanian, *Maiakovskii*, 301.

219. Khovin, "Bezotvetnye voprosy," 4: 1–5; 5: 2–5; 6: 12–13. Shklovskii, "Svertok"; "Ob iskusstve i revoliutsii," *Khod*, 16–17, 37–41.

220. Belous, *Vol'fila*, 1: 72–3. Shteinberg, *Druz'ia*, 25.

221. Tret'iakov, "B'em trevogu," 1–3. See also Katerina Clark, "'Quiet Revolution' in Soviet Intellectual Life," 213–16. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 43–4. Markov, *Russian Imagism*, 49.

222. "Torzhestvuiushchii oboz," 2.

223. Shklovskii, "Gamburgskii schet," 225–7.

224. Khodasevich, "Literatura i vlast' v sovetskoi Rossii" (1931), *Nekropol'*, 232, 237. Luknitskii (2–3 March 1925), *Vstrechi*, 44–5. Zamiatin, "Ia boius'" (1921), *Litsa*, 186–8.

225. Kornei Chukovskii (14 February 1922; 26 March 1922; 15 December 1922; 3 March 1925; 7 March 1926; 21 January 1928), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 189, 202, 219, 332, 379, 430. Freidin, *Coat*, 31, 210–11. Stanislawski, *Autobiographical Jews*, 72.

226. "Zapiska L. D. Trotskogo" (30 June 1922); "Zapiska I. V. Stalina" (3 July 1922); "Dokladnaia zapiska [. . .] I. V. Stalinu" (3 July 1922); "Postanovlenie Politbiuro" (6 July 1922); "Postanovlenie Politbiuro" (20 July 1922), in Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 36–41.

227. Christina Lodder, "From Futurist Iconoclasm to Socialist Construction"; Emily Finer, "A Rift on the Left Front?," in Brooker and Thacker, *Oxford Critical and Cultural History*, 3.2: 1304–20.

228. Aseev, "Khudozhestvennaia literatura," 73.

229. "Postanovlenie Politbiuro" (18 June 1925), in Artizov, *Vlast'*, 56–7. Trotskii, "Predislovie"; "Futurizm"; "Partiinaia politika v iskusstve," *Literatura*, 26–7, 113, 168–70.

230. On Maiakovskii's patrons, see Chukovskaia (26 April 1959; 11 November 1962), *Zapiski*, 2: 353, 547. Jangfeldt, *Stavka*, 247, 488–91.

231. Editorial, *Novyi LEF* 1 (1927), 1. Lodder, "From Futurist Iconoclasm," 1309.

232. Clark and Dobrenko, *Soviet Culture*, 5.

233. Randi Cox, "NEP without Nepmen!," in Kiaer and Naiman, *Everyday Life*, 121–2, 133. Golomshtok, *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*, 53.

234. Jakobson, "Budetlianin nauki," 64; Jangfeldt, *Stavka*, 488–91. Karabchievskii, *Voskresenie*, 42. State-funded trips abroad were part of this lifestyle. Scorning the "bourgeois" West, the LEF associates indulged in the material comforts afforded by such trips. Mocking the philistinism (*meshchanstvo*) of F. T. Marinetti's Italian public in a letter from Rome (22 December 1927), Nikolai Aseev asked Maiakovskii to facilitate a money transfer, so he could shop for clothes in Europe (Gosudarstvennyi Literaturnyi Muzei [Moscow], F. 139, Op. 1, Ed. khr. 30—I am grateful to Andrei Ustinov for sharing this source with me).

235. Viacheslav Polonskii, "Khudozhestvennoe tvorchestvo," 5–6, 21–2, 33.

236. Kornei Chukovskii (17 February 1926), *Dnevnik 1901–1929*, 369–71.

237. Khodasevich, "Dekol'tirovannaia loshad'," 222–3. Pasternak, *Liudi i polozheniia* (1956), *Vozdushnye puti*, 456–7. See also a defense of Maiakovskii and his circle against Ivanov-Razumnik's accusation of materialism in Grossman-Roshchin, "Sotsial'nyi zamysel," 115–16.

238. Jakobson, "Budetlianin nauki," 65. Livak, *How It Was Done*, 34–5, 88, 202. Mikhail Vaiskopf, "Mif Iakobsona o Maiakovskom," in Gindin, Grintser, and Shumilova, *Materialy*, 210–11.

239. Otsup, "O poezii," 134.

240. Mirskii, "The Present State of Russian Letters" (1927), *Uncollected Writings*, 247.

241. Aldanov, "O polozhenii," 409. Khodasevich, "Literatura v izgnanii," *Literaturnye stat'i*, 268–9. "Literatura ne kormit," 3. Merich [Damanskaia], "Privilegirovannyi klass," 3.

242. Bunin, "Tretii Tolstoi," *Okaiannye dni*, 307. Livak, "Émigration russe," 29–41; "Rannii period," 418–20, 430–40. Nosik, "Ne vyshlo by," 501–6.

243. See the letters of M. Vishniak and P. Bitsilli (25 January 1938; 13 September 1938), ed. M. Birman and M. Shruba, in Korostelev and Schruba, *"Sovremennye zapiski,"* 2: 603, 618.

244. See Livak, *Russian Émigrés*, 12–35. S. Postnikov (28 April 1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 203.

245. Livak, "Geroicheskie vremena molodoi zarubezhnoi poezii," in Livak and Ustinov, *Literaturnyi avangard*, 11–142.

246. Annenkov, *Dnevnik*, 1: 305–6. Babel' to I. Livshits (10 January 1928) and L. Nikulin (30 July 1933), *Sochineniia*, 1: 260, 331. See also Voronskii, "I. Babel'" (1924), *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*, 286.

247. Gazdanov, "Literaturnye priznaniia," 262–3. Knut, "Marginalii k istorii literatury," *Sobranie*, 1: 258.

248. Woolf, *Room*, 51–2. On the self-stylization of younger émigré writers, see Livak, *How It Was Done*, 41–4; "Nina Berberova," 463–78.

249. Adamovich, "Literaturnye zametki" (1931); "Mysli i somneniia" (1932), *Literaturnye zametki*, 1: 477–8, 2: 12; "O literature v emigratsii" (1932), 330–1. Otsup, "O poezii," 134–5. Poplavskii, "Literaturnaia anketa," 287; "O misticheskoi atmosfere," 309. Terapiano, "Chelovek," 210–12.

250. Khodasevich to Gorky (28 June 1923), *Sobranie*, 4: 460–1. Osorgin, "Vladimir Maiakovskii," 457–8. Ivanov-Razumnik, "Pisatel'skie sud'by" (1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 326–41. "Beseda s Borisom Zaitsevym," in Guerra, *"Kogda my v Rossiiu vernemsia,"* 77.

251. Adamovich, "Nesostoiavshaiasia progulka," 289–95. Bëm, "O sovetskoi literature" (1933), *Issledovaniia*, 387–8. Khodasevich, "Literatura i vlast' v sov. Rossii" (1931); "Krovavaia pishcha" (1932), *Nekropol'*, 227–8, 269. Otsup, "Iz dnevnika," 201.

252. Katerina Clark, "Little Heroes and Big Deeds," in Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Revolution*, 194–9.

253. Prishvin, *Dnevniki 1930–1931*, 578.

254. Lunacharskii, "Pisatel' i politik" (1931), *Stat'i*, 303–4. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vtoraia kniga*, 541. Reisner, "Bogema," 94–6. Startsev, "Eksperiment," 70–9.

255. Volkov, *Poeziia*, 59–61.

256. Blium, *Sovetskaia tsenzura*, 63. Fleishman, *Boris Pasternak v dvadtsatye*, 123–7. "Zapiska nachal'nika Glaviskusstva RSFSR [. . .] o vstreche s M. A. Bulgakovym" (30 July 1929); "Zapiska Sekretaria TsK VKP(b)" (3 August 1929); "Pis'mo M. A. Bulgakova I. V. Stalinu" (30 May 1931); "Pis'mo E. I. Zamiatina I. V. Stalinu" (June 1931), in Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 114–15, 148, 156.

257. Ginzburg, "Zapisnye knizhki," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 90, 93–4, 101, 107–13.

258. Frid, "Pol' Valeri," 157–76. See also Boris Groys, "A Style and a Half," in Lahusen and Dobrenko, *Socialist Realism*, 78–81.

259. Katerina Clark, "Little Heroes and Big Deeds," 204–5. Fleishman, *Boris Pasternak i literaturnoe dvizhenie*, 92–3. Groys, *Total Art*, 35. Walker, "*Kruzhok*," 122–3.

260. Shvarts, *Zhivu*, 584.

261. Chudakova, "Osvedomiteli v dome Bulgakova v seredine 1930-kh godov," in Chudakova, Toddes, and Tsiv'ian, *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*, 414–16. "Iz doklada Sekretno-Politicheskogo Otdela OGPU" (1931); "Podpol'naia listovka" (1934); "Spetsspravka" (1937), in Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 160, 227–8, 347–8. See also Fleishman, *Boris Pasternak i literaturnoe dvizhenie*, 546–8.

262. Lavrov, *Andrei Belyi*, 284–9. Spivak, *Andrei Belyi*, 423, 440–9.

263. Kornei Chukovskii (15 September 1936), *Dnevnik 1930–1969*, 149.

264. Avgust Letaver, "Milye serdtsu gody. . . ," in Veresova, *V nachale*, 33.

265. Elagin, *Ukroshchenie*, 142–3, 154–5. Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 245. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 331–4.

266. Ivanov-Razumnik to A. Remizov (27 May 1942), in Raevsky-Hughes, *Vstrecha*, 90–1. Erenburg, "Rech'," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s''ezd*, 183.

267. Adamovich, "Literatura v SSSR," 185–7.

268. "Rech' Zhan-Rishara Bloka"; "Rech' Bruno Iasenskogo"; "Rech' I. E. Babelia," in Luppol, Rozental', and Tret'iakov, *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s''ezd*, 189–91, 278, 279–80.

269. V. Kozhinov, "Smena stilei i klassicheskaia traditsiia," in Gei, *Mnogoobrazie*, 417.

270. Erenburg to Stalin (13 September 1934; 28 November 1935), *Na tsokole*, 137, 181–5. "Spetszapiska OGPU" (March 1932); "Pis'mo B. L. Pasternaka I. V. Stalinu" (5 December 1935), in Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 170–1, 275.

271. Elagin, *Ukroshchenie*, 67–9. "Pis'mo A. M. Gor'kogo" (8 December 1935), in Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 277. See also Fitzpatrick, *Cultural Front*, 246–7; *Everyday Stalinism*, 110–13.

272. "Spravka Sekretno-Politicheskogo Otdela GUGB," in Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 333–41.

273. Wachtel, *Development*, 214–16.

274. Bëm, "O sovetskoi literature" (1933), *Issledovaniia*, 386. Tertz, "On Socialist Realism," *Trial*, 195–219.

275. Josephson, *Infidel*, 210.

276. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 40-kh godov," *Zapisnye knizhki*, 169; "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," 304.

277. Chudakova, "Bez gneva i pristrastiia," *Literatura*, 333. "Dokladnaia zapiska" (1936), Artizov and Naumov, *Vlast'*, 298–300.

278. Bulgakov, *Master i Margarita*, *Izbrannye proizvedeniia*, 2: 464–5. Boris Maslov, "Traditsii literaturnogo diletantizma i esteticheskaia ideologiia romana 'Dar,'" in Leving and Soshkin, *Imperiia N*, 48.

279. Chukovskaia (6 May 1940), *Zapiski*, 1: 104–5. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 216.

280. Bulgakova, *Dnevnik*, 60. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 16.

281. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 200.

282. Gershtein, *Memuary*, 33, 44, 47, 209. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 26, 176–7, 186, 337; *Vtoraia kniga*, 538. Talov, *Vospominaniia*, 71. See also Freidin, *Coat*, 31–2. Loewen, *Most Dangerous Art*, 94–5.

283. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," 310.

284. Chukovskaia (14 February 1958), *Zapiski*, 2: 275–7.

285. Zholkovsky, "Obverse of Stalinism," 46–7. See also Harrington, "Anna Akhmatova's Biographical Myth-Making," 492–3.

286. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," 305.

287. Mackay, *Modernism*, 136–8.

288. George Orwell, "Writers and Leviathan," in Huszar, *Intellectuals*, 267.

289. Ginzburg, "Zapisi 1970–1980-kh godov," 285–6. Shvarts (7 December 1956), *Zhivu*, 630.

290. N. Mandel'shtam, *Vospominaniia*, 180.

291. Conrad, "Geography and Some Explorers," *Last Essays*, 3–19.

Bibliography

Primary Sources

Archival

Boris Nikolaevsky Collection; Gleb Struve Collection. Hoover Institution. Stanford University.

Collection Weidle. Bakhmeteff Archive. The Rare Book and Manuscript Library. Columbia University.

Fonds Eugène et Sophia Petit; Fonds Michel Ossorguine. Bibliothèque de Documentation Internationale Contemporaine (BDIC), Nanterre.

Fonds Ludmila Savitzky. Institut Mémoires de l'Édition Contemporaine (IMEC), Abbaye d'Ardenne, Saint-Germain la Blanche-Herbe.

Fond 139 (Vladimir Maiakovskii). Gosudarstvennyi Literaturnyi Muzei. Moscow.

Iurii Ivask Papers. Amherst Center for Russian Culture. Amherst College.

Nina Berberova Papers; Alexis Rannit Papers; Fedor Stepun Papers. Beinecke Library. Yale University.

N. N. Punin Diaries and Correspondence. Harry Ransom Humanities Research Center. University of Texas at Austin.

Published

Abramov, Al. "Vysokolobyi i nizkolobyi chitatel'." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 80 (24 June 1934), 1.

Abramovich, N. "O futurizme v literature." *Novaia zhizn´* 5-6 (1914), 105-6.

Adamovich, Georgii. "Eshche o 'zdes'' i 'tam.'" *Poslednie novosti* 5208 (27 June 1935), 3.

———. "Kommentarii." *Chisla* 2-3 (1930), 167-76.

———. *Kommentarii*. Edited by O. Korostelev. St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2000.

———. "Kommentarii." *Tsekh poetov* 4 (1923), 59-64.

———. "Literatura v SSSR." *Russkie zapiski* 7 (1938), 176-90.

———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 100 (29 December 1924), 2.

———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 108 (23 February 1925), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 109 (2 March 1925), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 130 (27 July 1925), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 132 (10 August 1925), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 135 (17 August 1925), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 136 (7 September 1925), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 152 (28 December 1925), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 156 (24 January 1926), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 157 (31 January 1926), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 172 (16 May 1926), 3–4.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 175 (6 June 1926), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 179 (4 July 1926), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 180 (11 July 1926), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 183 (1 August 1926), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 188 (5 September 1926), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 199 (21 November 1926), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 206 (9 January 1927), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 207 (16 January 1927), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 208 (23 January 1927), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 210 (6 February 1927), 1–2.
———. "Literaturnye vpechatleniia." *Sovremennye zapiski* 61 (1936), 205–12.
———. *Literaturnye zametki*. Edited by O. Korostelev, 2 vols. St. Petersburg: Aleteiia, 2002.
———. "Literaturnye zametki." *Zveno* 68 (19 May 1924), 2.
———. "Literaturnye zametki." *Zveno* 94 (17 November 1924), 2.
———. "Litsa i knigi." *Sovremennye zapiski* 53 (1933), 324–34.
———. "Nachalo." *Sovremennye zapiski* 41 (1930), 500–11.
———. "Na polustankakh." *Zveno* 36 (8 October 1923), 2.
———. "Na raznye temy." *Poslednie novosti* 4649 (14 December 1933), 3.
———. "Nesostoiavshaiasia progulka." *Sovremennye zapiski* 59 (1935), 288–96.
———. "Neznakomka." *Vstrechi* 1 (1934), 16–8.
———. "Ob M. Kuzmine." *Zveno* 89 (13 October 1924), 2.
———. "O Bunine." *Zveno* 54 (11 February 1924), 2.
———. "O frantsuzskoi 'inquiétude' i o russkoi trevoge." *Poslednie novosti* 2822 (13 December 1928), 2.
———. "O literature v emigratsii." *Poslednie novosti* 3732 (11 June 1931), 2.
———. "O literature v emigratsii." *Sovremennye zapiski* 50 (1932), 327–39.
———. "O polozhenii sovetskoi literatury." *Sovremennye zapiski* 48 (1932), 295–303.
———. "Otsenki Pushkina." *Poslednie novosti* 5145 (25 April 1935), 2.
———. "Pamiati Andreia Belogo." *Vstrechi* 2 (1934), 56–8.
———. "Pamiati sovetskoi literatury." *Russkie zapiski* 2 (1937), 206–13.

———. "Parizhskie vpechatleniia." *Poslednie novosti* 4767 (12 April 1934), 2.
———. "Pis'ma o Lermontove." *Poslednie novosti* 5411 (16 January 1936), 2.
———. "Poety v Peterburge." *Zveno* 32 (10 September 1923), 2.
———. "Poeziia v emigratsii." *Opyty* 4 (1955), 45–61.
———. "Sirin." *Poslednie novosti* 4670 (4 January 1934), 3.
———. "Sovremennye zapiski." *Poslednie novosti* 3144 (31 October 1929), 2.
———. "Sto pisem Georgiia Adamovicha k Iuriiu Ivasku (1935–1961)." Edited by N. Bogomolov. *Diaspora* 5 (2003), 402–557.
———. "V. Ianovskii. *Mir*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 52 (1933), 457–8.
———. "Vadim Andreev. *Nedug bytiia*.—Georgii Raevskii. *Strofy*.—Anatolii Shteiger. *Etot den'*. Vladimir Pozner. *Stikhi na sluchai*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 38 (1929), 521–6.
———. "Zhizn' i 'zhizn'.'" *Poslednie novosti* 5124 (4 April 1935), 2.
Adrianov, S. "Kriticheskie nabroski." *Vestnik Evropy* 1 (1910), 386–98.
Akhmatova, Anna. *Zapisnye knizhki Anny Akhmatovoi (1958–1966)*. Edited by K. Suvorova and V. Chernykh. Moscow: Giulio Einaudi, 1996.
Aldanov, Mark. "O polozhenii emigrantskoi literatury." *Sovremennye zapiski* 61 (1936), 400–9.
———. "O romane." *Sovremennye zapiski* 52 (1933), 433–7.
Aleksandrovich, Iurii. *Istoriia noveishei russkoi literatury, 1880–1910*. Vol. 1: *Chekhov i ego vremia*. Moscow: Sfinks, 1911.
———. *Posle Chekhova*. Vol. 1: *Ocherk molodoi literatury poslednego desiatiletiia, 1898–1908*. Moscow: n.p., 1908.
———. *Posle Chekhova*. Vol. 2: *Nigilizm-modern i nashi moralisty*. Moscow: Osnova, 1909.
Alekseev, A., et al., eds. *Russkaia khudozhestvennaia kul'tura kontsa XIX–nachala XX veka*. Vol. 1: *Zrelishchnye iskusstva. Muzyka*. Moscow: Nauka, 1968.
Al'medingen, Georgii. "Zapiski mechtatelei." *Kniga i revoliutsiia* 8 (20) (1922), 22–4.
Amfiteatrov, Aleksandr. "Literaturnye vpechatleniia." *Sovremennik* 1 (1911), 319–49.
Andreev, Daniil, and V. Beklemisheva, eds. *Rekviem. Sbornik pamiati Leonida Andreeva*. Moscow: Federatsiia, 1930.
Andreev, Leonid, and Maksim Gor'kii. *Neizdannaia perepiska*, edited by I. Zil'bershtein. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 72. Moscow: Nauka, 1965.
Anichkov, Evgenii. *Novaia russkaia poeziia*. Berlin: I. Ladyzhnikov, 1923. Facsimile reprint. The Hague: Mouton, 1969.
———. "Poslednie pobegi russkoi poezii." *Zolotoe runo* 3–4 (1908), 103–12.
———. *Realizm i novye veianiia*. St. Petersburg: Osvobozhdenie, 1909.
Anisimov, I., and Ia. El'sberg, eds. *Problemy realizma*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1959.
Anisimov, Ivan. "O nasledstve i 'novatorstve.'" *Literaturnaia gazeta* 14 (23 March 1933), 1, 4.

Annenkov, Iurii. *Dnevnik moikh vstrech*. 2 vols. New York: Mezhdunarodnoe literaturnoe sodruzhestvo, 1966.

Annenskii, Innokentii. "O sovremennom lirizme." *Apollon* 1 (1909), 12–42; 2 (1909), 3–29; 3 (1909), 5–29.

Apostolov, N. *Impressionizm i modernizm*. Kiev: n.p., 1908.

Arabazhin, K. I. *Etiudy o russkikh pisateliakh*. St. Petersburg: Prometei, 1912.

Arland, Marcel. *Essais et nouveaux essais critiques*. Paris: Gallimard, 1952.

Artizov, Andrei, and Oleg Naumov, eds. *Vlast´ i khudozhestvennaia inelligentsiia*. Moscow: Demokratiia, 1999.

Arvatov, Boris. "Literatura i byt." *Zvezda* 6 (1925), 309–18.

Aseev, Nikolai. "Khudozhestvennaia literatura." *Pechat´ i revoliutsiia* 7 (1922), 68–80.

———. *Nochnaia fleita*. Moscow: Lirika, 1914.

Ashukin, Nikolai. "Sovremennost' v literature." *Novaia russkaia kniga* 6 (1922), 4–6.

Asmus, Valentin. "Filosofiia i estetika russkogo simvolizma." *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 27–28. Moscow: Zhurnal'no-gazetnoe ob"edinenie, 1937, 1–53.

Aurier, Albert. "Boniment initial." *Le Moderniste illustré* 1 (6 April 1889), 2.

Auslender, Sergei. "Iz Peterburga." *Zolotoe runo* 2 (1908), 65–7.

Babel', Isaak. *Sochineniia*. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1991–92.

Bachinskii, A. "*Fakely*. Kniga pervaia." *Zolotoe runo* 5 (1906), 82–4.

Bal'mont, Konstantin. *Gornye vershiny*. Moscow: Grif, 1904.

———. *Konstantin Bal'mont—Ivanu Shmelevu. Pis'ma i stikhotvoreniia 1926–1936*. Edited by K. Azadovskii and G. Bongard-Levin. Moscow: Sobranie, 2005.

———. "Nashe literaturnoe segodnia." *Zolotoe runo* 11–12 (1907), 60–3.

Bank, B., and A. Vilenkin, eds. *Krest´ianskaia molodezh´ i kniga*. Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1929.

Baudelaire, Charles. *Œuvres complètes*. 2 vols. Edited by C. Pichois. Paris: Gallimard-Pléiade, 1976.

Bazarov, V. "O. Shpengler i ego kritiki." *Krasnaia nov´* 2 (1922), 211–31.

Belyi, Andrei [Boris Bugaev, Ianovskii]. "Aleksandr Blok. *Nechaiannaia radost´*." *Pereval* 4 (1907), 59–61.

———. "Anatema." *Vesy* 9 (1909), 103–6.

———. *Arabeski*. 1911. Facsimile reprint. Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1969.

———. "Chekhov." *Vesy* 8 (1904), 1–9.

———. "Detskaia svistul'ka." *Vesy* 8 (1907), 54–8.

———. "E. V. Anichkov. Iskusstvo i sotsialisticheskii stroi." *Zolotoe runo* 6 (1906), 100.

———. "Ibsen i Dostoevskii." *Vesy* 12 (1905), 47–54.

———. "Krititsizm i simvolizm." *Vesy* 2 (1904), 1–13.

———. "Kumir na glinianykh nogakh." *Pereval* 8–9 (1907), 70–5.

———. "Literaturno-khudozhestvennye al'manakhi izdatel'stva 'Shipovnik.'" *Pereval* 8–9 (1907), 94–5.

———. "Literaturnyi raspad." *Vesy* 5 (1908), 69–72.

———. *"Liubliu tebia nezhno. . . ." Pis'ma Andreia Belogo k materi*. Edited by S. Voronin. Moscow: Reka vremen, 2013.
———. "M. Kuzmin. *Kryl'ia*." *Pereval* 6 (1907), 50–1.
———. "Na perevale." *Vesy* 12 (1905), 70–1.
———. "Nastoiashchee i budushchee russkoi literatury." *Vesy* 2 (1909), 59–68.
———. "Neskol'ko slov dekadenta, obrashchennykh k liberalam i konservatoram." *Mir iskusstva* 7 (1903), 65–7.
———. "Nikolai Il'ich Storozhenko." *Vesy* 2 (1906), 67–8.
———. "O simvolizme." *Trudy i dni* 1 (1912), 10–24; 2 (1912), 1–7.
———. *Peterburg*. 1913. Edited by L. Dolgopolov. Moscow: Nauka, 1981.
———. "Pevitsa." *Mir iskusstva* 11 (1902), 302–4.
———. *Pochemu ia stal simvolistom*. 1928. Ann Arbor: Ardis, 1982.
———. "Shtempelevannaia kalosha." *Vesy* 5 (1907), 49–52.
———. "Shtempelevannaia kul'tura." *Vesy* 9 (1909), 72–80.
———. *Simvolizm*. Moscow: Musaget, 1910.
———. "Simvolizm i sovremennoe russkoe iskusstvo." *Vesy* 10 (1908), 38–48.
———. "Simvolizm kak miroponimanie." *Mir iskusstva* 5 (1904), 173–96.
———. "Slovo pravdy." *Vesy* 9 (1908), 59–62.
———. "Teoriia ili staraia baba." *Vesy* 4 (1908), 38–42.
———. "Tiazhelaia lira i russkaia lirika." *Sovremennye zapiski* 15 (1923), 371–88.
———. "Vishnevyi sad." *Vesy* 2 (1904), 45–8.
———. "Vol'nootpushchenniki." *Vesy* 2 (1908), 69–72.
———. "V zashchitu ot odnogo narekaniia." *Vesy* 6 (1905), 40–2.
———. "Venok ili venets." *Apollon* 11 (1910), 1–4.
———. "Vospominaniia o A. A. Bloke." *Epopeia* 1 (1922), 123–273; 2 (1922), 105–299; 3 (1922), 125–310.
Belyi, Andrei, and Aleksandr Blok. *Perepiska 1903–1919*. Edited by A. Lavrov. Moscow: Progress-Pleiada, 2001.
Belyi, Andrei, and R. V. Ivanov-Razumnik. *Perepiska*. Edited by A. Lavrov and J. Malmstad. St. Petersburg: Atheneum-Feniks, 1998.
Bëm, Al'fred. *Issledovaniia. Pis'ma o literature*. Edited by S. Bocharov and I. Surat. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2001.
———. "Iurii Tynianov. *Voskovaia persona*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 50 (1932), 461–2.
———. *Pis'ma o literature*. Edited by L. Beloshevskaia and M. Bubenikova. Prague: Slovanský ústav, 1996.
———. "Ol'ga Forsh. *Sumasshedshii korabl'*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 49 (1932), 457–8.
Benois, Aleksandr. "Volshebnoe zerkal'tse." *Mir iskusstva* 1 (1904), 1–6.
Berberova, Nina. "Zelenaia lampa. Beseda III." *Novyi korabl'* 2 (1927), 42–3.
Berdiaev, Nikolai. "Dekadentstvo i misticheskii realizm." *Russkaia mysl'* 6 (1907), 114–23.
———. *Filosofiia neravenstva*. Berlin: Obelisk, 1923.

———. *Krizis iskusstva*. 1918. Moscow: Interprint, 1990.
———. "Kul'tura i politika." *Voprosy zhizni* 4-5 (1905), 320-34.
———. "Revoliutsiia i kul'tura." *Poliarnaia zvezda* 2 (22 December 1905), 146-55.
———. "Russkii soblazn." *Russkaia mysl'* 11 (1910), 104-15.
———. *Samopoznanie*. 1940. Moscow: DEM, 1990.
———. "V zashchitu khristianskoi svobody." *Sovremennye zapiski* 24 (1925), 285-303.
Berge, André. *L'Esprit de la littérature moderne*. Paris: Perrin, 1930.
"Beseda o russkom simvolizme." *Zveno* 166 (4 April 1926), 8.
Bitsilli, Pëtr. "Formula nashego vremeni." *Sovremennye zapiski* 59 (1935), 391-9.
———. "Iv. Bunin. *Bozh'e Drevo*." *Chisla* 5 (1931), 222-3.
———. "Venok na grob romana." *Chisla* 7-8 (1933), 166-73.
———. "Wladimir Weidlé. Les Abeilles d'Aristée." *Sovremennye zapiski* 64 (1937), 471-3.
———. "Zhizn' i literatura." *Sovremennye zapiski* 51 (1933), 273-87.
Blok, Aleksandr. *Dnevnik Al. Bloka*. Edited by P. Medvedev. 2 vols. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo pisatelei v Leningrade, 1928.
———. "Iunosheskii dnevnik," edited by V. Orlov. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 27-28. Moscow: Zhurnal'no-gazetnoe ob'edinenie, 1937, 299-370.
———. "O sovremennom sostoianii russkogo simvolizma." *Apollon* 8 (1910), 21-30.
———. "Perepiska s R. V. Ivanovym-Razumnikom," edited by A. Lavrov. In *Aleksandr Blok. Novye materialy i issledovaniia. Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 92.2. Moscow: Nauka, 1981, 366-414.
———. "Rossiia i intelligentsiia." *Zolotoe runo* 1 (1909), 78-85.
———. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 8 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1960-62.
———. "Tri voprosa." *Zolotoe runo* 2 (1908), 55-9.
———. "Voprosy, voprosy i voprosy." *Zolotoe runo* 11-12 (1908), 62-9.
Blok, Liubov'. *I byl' i nebylitsy o Bloke i o sebe*. Edited by I. Paulmann and L. Fleishman. Bremen: Verlag K-Presse, 1977.
Bogdanov, Aleksandr. *Krasnaia zvezda. Inzhener Menni*. Edited by B. Rullkötter. Hamburg: Helmut Buske, 1979.
Bontempelli, Massimo. "Définitions." *"900." Cahiers d'Italie et d'Europe* 1 (1926), 178-84.
Brik, Osip. "Khudozhnik-proletarii." *Iskusstvo kommuny* 2 (15 December 1918), 1.
———. "Neumestnoe politikanstvo." *Knizhnyi ugol* 2 (1918), 28-9.
———. "Za politiku!" *Novyi LEF* 1 (1927), 19-24.
Briusov, Valerii [Avrelii, V. Bakulin]. "A. L. Volynskii. *Kniga velikogo gneva*," *Vesy* 2 (1904), 67-8.
———. "Athenaeum o evropeiskoi literature za 1904 g.—Rossiia." *Vesy* 9 (1904), 48-53.
———. "Bal'mont." *Mir iskusstva* 7-8 (1903), 29-36.
———. *Dalekie i blizkie.* Moscow: Skorpion, 1912.

———. *Dnevniki 1891-1910*. Edited by I. Briusova and N. Ashukin. Moscow: M. i S. Sabashnikovy, 1927.
———. *Dnevniki. Avtobiograficheskaia proza. Pis'ma*. Moscow: OLMA-Press, 2002.
———. "Fakely." *Vesy* 5 (1906), 54-8.
———. "Fëdor Sologub. Kniga skazok." *Vesy* 11 (1904), 50-1.
———. "Iv. A. Bunin. *Novye stikhotvoreniia*." *Novyi put'* 1 (1903), 193-4.
———. "Kliuchi tain." *Vesy* 1 (1904), 3-21.
———. "Letters of V. Ja. Brjusov to M. A. Kuzmin." Edited by G. Cheron. *Wiener Slawistischer Almanach* 7 (1981), 65-79.
———. "N. Gumilev. Put' konkvistadorov. Stikhi." *Vesy* 11 (1905), 68.
———. "O 'rechi rabskoi,' v zashchitu poezii." *Apollon* 9 (1910), 31-4.
———. "Perepiska s Andreem Belym," edited by S. Grechishkin and A. Lavrov. In *Valerii Briusov. Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 85. Moscow: Nauka, 1976, 327-427.
———. "Perepiska s K. D. Bal'montom. 1894-1918," edited by A. Ninov and R. Shcherbakov. In *Valerii Briusov i ego korrespondenty*. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 98.1. Moscow: Nauka, 1991, 30-239.
———. "Perepiska s N. S. Gumilevym (1906-1920)," edited by R. Shcherbakov and R. Timenchik. In *Valerii Briusov i ego korrespondenty*. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 98.2. Moscow: Nauka, 1994, 400-514.
———. "Perepiska s Viacheslavom Ivanovym. 1903-1923," edited by S. Grechishkin, N. Kotrelev and A. Lavrov. In *Valerii Briusov. Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 85. Moscow: Nauka, 1976, 428-45.
———. "Pis'ma iz rabochikh tetradei (1893-1899)," edited by S. Gindin. In *Valerii Briusov i ego korrespondenty*. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 98.1. Moscow: Nauka, 1991, 556-828.
———. "Pis'ma k F. Sologubu," edited by V. Orlov and I. Iampol'skii. *Ezhegodnik rukopisnogo otdela Pushkinskogo doma na 1973 god*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1976, 104-25.
———. "Pis'ma k peterburgskim i moskovskim literatoram," edited by E. Litvin et al. In *Valerii Briusov. Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 85. Moscow: Nauka, 1976, 662-710.
———. "Proekt vseobshchego primireniia." *Vesy* 4 (1908), 45-8.
———, ed. *Russkie simvolisty*. 3 vols. Moscow: n.p., 1894-95.
———. *Sredi stikhov, 1894-1929*. Edited by N. Bogomolov and N. Kotrelev. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.
———. "Strast'." *Vesy* 8 (1904), 21-8.
———. "Sviashchennaia zhertva." *Vesy* 1 (1905), 23-9.
———. "Svoboda slova." *Vesy* 11 (1905), 61-6.
———. "Torzhestvo pobeditelei." *Vesy* 9 (1907), 52-7.
———. "Une lettre de M. Valère Brussov." *Le Mercure de France* 245 (1 September 1907), 188.
———. "Vchera, segodnia i zavtra russkoi poezii." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 7 (1922), 38-68.

Brylov, G., N. Lebedev, B. Maiberg, and V. Sakharov, eds. *Golos rabochego chitatelia*. Leningrad: Krasnaia gazeta, 1929.

Brylov, G., N. Veis, and V. Sakharov, eds. *Pisatel' pered sudom rabochego chitatelia*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo Leningradskogo Soveta Profsoiuzov, 1928.

Bulgakov, Mikhail. *Izbrannye proizvedeniia*. 2 vols. Edited by L. Ianovskaia. Kiev: Dnipro, 1989.

Bulgakov, Mikhail, and Elena Bulgakova. *Dnevnik Mastera i Margarity*. Edited by V. Losev. Moscow: Vagrius, 2001.

Bulgakova, Elena. *Dnevnik*. Edited by V. Losev and L. Ianovskaia. Moscow: Knizhnaia palata, 1990.

Bunin, Ivan. *Okaiannye dni. Vospominaniia. Stat'i*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.

Burenin, Viktor. *Gore ot gluposti*. St. Petersburg: A. S. Suvorin, 1905.

Carlisle, Olga. *Island in Time: A Memoir of Childhood*. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston, 1980.

Chaadaev, N. "O psevdorevoliutsionerakh, priemliushchikh revoliutsiiu." *Utrenniki* 2 (1922), 187–9.

Chebotarevskaia, Anastasiia. "Iz dnevnika." *Dnevniki pisatelei* 1 (March 1914), 26–33.

———. "Po povodu nekotorykh iubileev." *Ocharovannyi strannik* 2 (1913), 10–11.

Chekhov, Anton. *Perepiska A. P. Chekhova*. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1984.

———. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii i pisem*. 30 vols. Moscow: Nauka, 1974–82.

Chernov, Viktor. "Modernizm v russkoi poezii." *Vestnik Evropy* (November 1910), 209–28; (December 1910), 107–35.

Chudovskii, Valerian. "Futurizm i proshloe." *Apollon* 6 (1913), 25–30.

———. "O Merezhkovskom, Nekrasove i o politike v iskusstve." *Apollon* 7 (1913), 47–52.

———. "Po povodu stikhov Anny Akhmatovoi." *Apollon* 5 (1912), 45–50.

———. "'Russkaia mysl'' i romany V. Briusova, Z. Gippius, D. Merezhkovskogo." *Apollon* 2 (1913), 72–7.

———. "Zametki o russkoi belletristike." *Apollon* 5 (1912), 51–4.

Chukovskaia, Lidiia. *Zapiski ob Anne Akhmatovoi*. Vol. 1: *1938–1941*. Vol. 2: *1952–1962*. Vol. 3: *1963–1966*. Moscow: Soglasie, 1997.

Chukovskii, Kornei. *Chukokkala*. Moscow: Prem'era, 1999.

———. *Dnevnik 1901–1929*. Moscow: Sovremennyi pisatel', 1997.

———. *Dnevnik 1930–1969*. Moscow: Sovremennyi pisatel', 1997.

———. *Futuristy*. Petrograd: Poliarnaia zvezda, 1922.

———. *Kniga o sovremennykh pisateliakh*. St. Petersburg: Shipovnik, 1914.

———. *Litsa i maski*. St. Petersburg: Shipovnik, 1914.

———. *Liudi i knigi*. Moscow: GIKhL, 1960.

———. "Nekrasov i my." *Letopis' doma literatorov* 3 (1 December 1921), 3.

———. *Ot Chekhova do nashikh dnei*. Moscow: Vol'f, 1909.

———. "Peterburgskie teatry." *Zolotoe runo* 2 (1907), 75–6.
———. "Pshibyshevskii o simvole." *Vesy* 11 (1904), 37.
———. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 15 vols. Edited by E. Ivanova and E. Chukovskaia. Moscow: Terra, 2002–8.
———. "Tsiferblat g. Bel'tova." *Vesy* 2 (1906), 46–51.
Chukovskii, Nikolai. *O tom, chto videl*. Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 2005.
Chulkov, Georgii. "Chetvertyi sbornik 'Znaniia.'" *Voprosy zhizni* 3 (1905), 289–94.
———. *Gody stranstvii*. Moscow: Federatsiia, 1930.
———. *Nashi sputniki. Literaturnye ocherki. 1912–1922*. Moscow: N. V. Vasil'ev, 1922.
———. *O misticheskom anarkhizme*. 1906. Letchworth: Prideaux Press, 1971.
———. *Pokryvalo Izidy*. Moscow: Zolotoe runo, 1909.
Chuzhak, Nikolai, ed. *Literatura fakta*. 1929. Facsimile reprint. Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972.
———. "Pod znakom zhiznestroeniia." *LEF* 1 (1923), 12–39.
Conrad, Joseph. *Last Essays*. London: J. M. Dent & Sons, 1926.
Damanskaia, Avgusta [Arsenii Merich]. "Privilegirovannyi klass." *Poslednie novosti* 1856 (22 April 1926), 3.
Dobroliubov, Aleksandr. *Sochineniia*. Edited by J. D. Grossmann. Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1981.
Dolinin, Arkadii. "Akmeizm." *Zavety* 5 (1913), 161.
———. *Dostoevskii i drugie*. Leningrad: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1989.
Dorovatovskii, S., and A. Charushnikov, eds. *Ocherki realisticheskogo mirovozzreniia*. St. Petersburg: Tipografiia Montvida, 1904.
Dubinskii, M. "Mysli o sovremennoi arkhitekture." *Chisla* 6 (1932), 244–6.
Dunham, Vera. *In Stalin's Time: Middleclass Values in Soviet Fiction*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1976.
Editorial. *Novyi LEF* 1 (1927), 1.
Editorial. *Severnye tsvety* 3 (1903), n.p.
Eikhenbaum, Boris. "Dnevnik 1917–1918 gg." Edited by V. Nekhotin and O. Eikhenbaum. *De Visu* 1 (1993), 11–27.
———. "Illiuziia skaza." *Knizhnyi ugol* 2 (1918), 10–13.
———. "Metody i podkhody." *Knizhnyi ugol* 8 (1922), 13–23.
———. *"Moi vremennik. . . ."* St. Petersburg: Inapress, 2001.
———. *O literature*. Edited by O. Eikhenbaum and E. Toddes. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987.
———. *O poezii.* Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1969.
———. "Perepiska B. M. Eikhenbauma i V. M. Zhirmunskogo," edited by N. Zhirmunskaia, O. Eikhenbaum, and E. Toddes. *Tynianovskii sbornik* 3. Riga: Zinatne, 1988, 256–329.
———. "V ozhidanii literatury." *Russkii sovremennik* 1 (1924), 280–90.
Elagin, Iurii. *Ukroshchenie iskusstv*. New York: Izdatel'stvo imeni Chekhova, 1952.

Ellis [Lev Kobylinskii]. "Esche odna korona." *Vesy* 6 (1908), 62–3.
———. "'Frantsuzskie liriki XIX veka.' Perevod V. Briusova." *Vesy* 7 (1909), 87–93.
———. "Itogi simvolizma." *Vesy* 7 (1909), 54–74.
———. "Ivanov-Razumnik. *Istoriia russkoi obshchestvennoi mysli*." *Vesy* 11 (1907), 54–7.
———. "*Korabli*. Sbornik stikhov i prozy." *Vesy* 5 (1907), 73–6.
———. "Krizis sovremennogo teatra." *Vesy* 9 (1908), 63–6.
———. "Literaturno-khudozhestvennye al'manakhi izd. 'Shipovnik.'" *Vesy* 8 (1907), 65–8.
———. "Literaturnyi nevod." *Vesy* 10 (1908), 81–6.
———. "Nashi epigony." *Vesy* 2 (1908), 61–8.
———. "Ob al'manakhakh." *Vesy* 5 (1909), 69–75.
———. "O sovremennom simvolizme, o 'chorte' i o 'deistve.'" *Vesy* 1 (1909), 75–82.
———. "O vandalizme v sovremennoi kritike.—*Literaturnyi raspad*." *Vesy* 3 (1909), 83–7.
———. *Russkie simvolisty*. 1910. Tomsk: Vodolei, 1996.
Eliot, T. S. *For Lancelot Andrewes*. London: Faber & Gwyer, 1928.
———. *Selected Essays*. London: Faber and Faber, 1953.
Erenburg, Il'ia [Jean Salot]. *Dai oglianut'sia . . . Pis'ma 1908–1930*. Edited by B. Frezinskii. Moscow: Agraf, 2004.
———. *Na tsokole istorii . . . Pis'ma 1931–1967*. Edited by B. Frezinskii. Moscow: Agraf, 2004.
———. *Neobychainye pokhozhdeniia Khulio Khurenito i ego uchenikov*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1923.
———. "Novaia proza." *Novaia russkaia kniga* 9 (1922), 1–3.
———. "Novoe iskusstvo v Rossii." *Novaia russkaia kniga* 1 (1922), 10–13.
———. "Paragviana." *Vecherniaia Moskva* 58 (12 March 1933), 3.
———. "Russkaia poeziia." *Veshch'* 1–2 (1922), 8–9.
Ermichev, A. A., ed. *N. A. Berdiaev. Pro et contra*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg: RKhGi, 1994.
Ermilov, Vladimir. "Obostrenie klassovoi bor'by na literaturnom fronte." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 65 (3 December 1931), 3.
———. "RAPP dolzhen byt' bol'shevistskim avangardom sovetskoi literatury." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 25 (7 October 1929), 2.
Ezhov, I. S., and E. I. Shamurin. *Russkaia poeziia XX veka. Antologiia russkoi liriki ot simvolizma do nashikh dnei*. Moscow: Novaia Moskva, 1925. Facsimile reprint. Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972.
Fadeev, Aleksandr. *Razgrom*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1973.
———. "Za bol'shuiu literaturu proletariata." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 5 (28 January 1932), 2.
Fedotov, Georgii. "Bor'ba za iskusstvo." *Novyi Grad* 10 (1935), 29–43.
———. "Chetverodnevnyi Lazar'." *Krug* 1 (1936), 139–43.
———. "O smerti, kul'ture i 'Chislakh.'" *Chisla* 4 (1930–31), 143–8.
———. "Rossiia, Evropa i my." *Novyi Grad* 2 (1932), 3–14.

———. "Sozdanie elity." *Sovremennye zapiski* 68 (1939), 388–407.
Fel'zen, Iurii. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 2 vols. Moscow: Vodolei, 2012.
"Filosoficheskoe obosnovanie blagonamerennosti." *Blagonamerennyi* 1 (1926), 3–10.
Filosofov, Dmitrii. "Berlinskie vystavki." *Mir iskusstva* 19–20 (1900), 148–52.
———. "Dela domashnie." *Tovarishch* 379 (23 September 1907), 3.
———. "Druz'ia ili vragi." *Russkaia mysl'* 8 (1909), 120–47.
———. "Gor'kii o religii." *Pereval* 8–9 (1907), 78–82.
———. "Iskusstvo i gosudarstvo." *Zolotoe runo* 6 (1907), 31–40.
———. "Natsionalizm i dekadentstvo." *Mir iskusstva* 21–22 (1900), 207–12.
———. "Novye izdaniia 'Skorpiona.'" *Mir iskusstva* 14 (1903), 153–4.
———. "O 'lzhi' Gor'kogo." *Novyi put'* 6 (June 1903), 212–17.
Fokht, Vsevolod. "Volia Rossii." *Novyi dom* 1 (1926), 38–40.
Fondaminskii, Il'ia. "Zelenaia lampa. Beseda III." *Novyi korabl'* 2 (1927), 43–6.
Fontainas, Andrée. *Mes souvenirs du symbolisme*. Paris: La nouvelle revue critique, 1928.
Forsh, Ol'ga. *Letoshnii sneg*. Moscow: Pravda, 1990.
Frid, Ia. "Pol' Valeri i formalizm v iskusstve." *Literaturnyi kritik* 4 (1937), 157–76.
Furmanov, Dmitrii. *Chapaev*. Moscow: OGIZ, 1947.
Gal'perina, E. "Marsel' Prust." *Literaturnyi kritik* 7 (1934), 153–77.
Gazdanov, Gaito. "Literaturnye priznaniia." *Vstrechi* 6 (1934), 259–62.
Gei, Nikolai, ed. *Mnogoobrazie stilei sovetskoi literatury*. Moscow: Nauka, 1978.
Gershtein, Emma. *Memuary*. St. Petersburg: Inapress, 1998.
Ghil, René. "Pis'ma o frantsuzskoi poezii. Poeticheskoe dvizhenie 1884–1895 goda." *Vesy* 7 (1905), 26–38.
———. "Sovremennye napravleniia literatury, iskusstva i filosofii vo Frantsii." *Apollon* 6 (1910), 5–24.
"Gibel' literaturnykh shkol vo Frantsii." *Vesy* 1 (1905), 79.
Gide, André. *Retour de l'U.R.S.S.* Paris: Gallimard, 1936.
Ginzburg, Lidiia. *Literatura v poiskakh real'nosti*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987.
———. *O literaturnom geroe*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1979.
———. *Prokhodiashchie kharaktery*. Edited by E. Van Baskirk and A. Zorin. Moscow: Novoe izdatel'stvo, 2011.
———. *Zapisnye knizhki. Vospominaniia. Esse*. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo, 2002.
Gippius, Vladimir. "O novoi tochke zreniia v russkoi kritike." *Mir iskusstva* 13–14 (1900), 21–4.
Gippius, Zinaida [Anton Krainii, tovarishch German]. "Literaturnaia zapis'. O molodykh i srednikh." *Sovremennye zapiski* 19 (1924), 234–49.
———. "Literaturnye razmyshleniia." *Chisla* 1 (1930), 144–9.
———. "O 'Shipovnike.'—Chelovek i boloto." *Vesy* 5 (1907), 53–8.
———. "Propisi." *Novyi dom* 1 (1926), 17–20.
———. "U kogo my v rabstve." *Za svobodu* 177 (8 July 1931), 3.

———. "Zelenaia lampa. Beseda II." *Novyi korabl'* 1 (1927), 35-9.
Gizetti. "O Bloke." *Vestnik literatury* 10 (1921), 3-4.
Gladkov, Fëdor. *Tsement*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1967.
Glinskii, B. "Bolezn' ili reklama?" *Istoricheskii vestnik* 63.2 (1896), 618-55.
Gofman, Modest. *Kniga o russkikh poetakh poslednego desiatiletiia*. 1908. Facsimile reprint. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1970.
Gofman, Viktor. "A. Fedorov. *Rasskazy*." *Vesy* 12 (1907), 56-7.
Gofshtetter, I. *Poeziia vyrozhdeniia. Filosofskie i psikhologicheskie motivy dekadentstva*. St. Petersburg: n.p., 1902.
Golovin, R. "Fëdor Sologub. *Zaklinatel'nitsa zmei*." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 6 (1922), 304-6.
Gomolitskii, Lev. *Sochineniia russkogo perioda*. 3 vols. Edited by L. Fleishman, L. Beloshevskaia, and P. Mintser. Moscow: Vodolei, 2011.
Gorbov, Dmitrii. "10 let literatury za rubezhom." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 8 (1927), 9-35.
———. "'Feniks.' Sbornik khud-literaturnyi." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 2 (1923), 227-30.
———. *Poiski Galatei.* Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929.
———. *U nas i za rubezhom*. Moscow: Artel' pisatelei "Krug," 1928.
Gor'kii, Maksim. *Nesvoevremennye mysli*. Edited by G. Ermolaev. Paris: Editions de la Seine, 1971.
———. "O formalizme." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 21 (10 April 1936), 2.
———. *O literature*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1935.
———. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 30 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1953.
Gornfel'd, Arkadii. *Knigi i liudi*. St. Petersburg: Zhizn', 1908.
Gorodetskaia, Nadezhda. "Spor pokolenii." *Vozrozhdenie* 2417 (14 January 1932), 5.
Gorodetskii, Sergei. "Nekotorye techeniia v sovremennoi russkoi poezii." *Apollon* 1 (1913), 46-50.
———. "Obzor oblastnoi poezii." *Krasnaia nov'* 4 (1921), 278-84.
———. "Protiv bessoderzhatel'noi formy i neoformlennogo soderzhaniia." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 18 (27 March 1936), 3.
Grabar', Igor'. "Miunkhenskie vystavki." *Mir iskusstva* 15-16 (1900), 61-4; 17-18 (1900), 100-4.
———. *Moia zhizn'*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1937.
———. "Pis'ma o sovremennom iskusstve." *Mir iskusstva* 4 (1902), 74-8.
Grits, T., V. Trenin, and M. Nikitin. *Slovesnost' i kommertsiia. Knizhnaia lavka A. F. Smirdina*. Edited by V. Shklovskii and B. Eikhenbaum. 1929. Moscow: Agraf, 2001.
Grossman-Roshchin, Iuda. "Sotsial'nyi zamysel futurizma." *LEF* 4 (1924), 109-24.
Gumilev, Nikolai. "Nasledie simvolizma i akmeizm." *Apollon* 1 (1913), 42-5.
———. "Nekrologi." *Apollon* 7 (1911), 77-8.
———. "Pis'ma o russkoi poezii." *Apollon* 8 (1910), 59-62; 6 (1912), 52-4; 9 (1912), 53-4.

———. "Pis'mo o russkoi poezii." *Apollon* 1-2 (1914), 122-30.
———. "Poeziia v 'Vesakh.'" *Apollon* 9 (1910), 42-4.
———. "Zhizn' stikha." *Apollon* 7 (1910), 5-14.
Gureev, Vl. "Idealisty i realisty." *Mir iskusstva* 16-17 (1899), 83-96.
Gurevich, Liubov'. *Literatura i estetika*. Moscow: Russkaia mysl', 1912.
———. "Literatura nashego vremeni." *Novyi zhurnal dlia vsekh* 3 (1909), 98-104.
Ianovskii, Vasilii. *Polia Eliseiskie*. New York: Serebrianyi vek, 1983.
Iarkov, Nikolai. "Sbornik tovarishchestva 'Znanie' za 1903 god." *Vesy* 6 (1904), 56-7.
Iaroslavskii, Emel'ian. "Protiv levoi frazy i nedobrosovestnoi kritiki." *Revoliutsiia i kul'tura* 3-4 (1928), 29-37.
Iashchenko, Aleksandr. "Literatura za piat' istekshikh let." *Novaia russkaia kniga* 11-12 (1922), 1-7.
———. "Nenuzhnye prepiatstviia." *Novaia russkaia kniga* 5-6 (1923), 1-5.
———. "O novykh putiakh i 'novom' iskusstve." *Novaia russkaia kniga* 3 (1922), 1-3.
Il'in, Ivan, and Ivan Shmelëv, *Perepiska dvukh Ivanov (1927-1934)*. Edited by Iu. Lisitsa. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 2000.
Intelligentsiia v Rossii. Sbornik statei. St. Petersburg: Zemlia, 1910.
"Iskusstvo i politika." *Poslednie novosti* 3557 (18 December 1930), 3.
Istoriia russkoi literatury. Vol. 10: *Literatura 1890-1917 godov*. Edited by A. Bushmin et al. Moscow: AN SSSR, 1954.
Ivanov, Fëdor. "Fetishisty fakta." *Krasnaia nov'* 7 (1929), 227-36.
Ivanov, Georgii. "O novykh stikhakh." *Apollon* 6-7 (1916), 71-5.
———. "Stikhi v zhurnalakh, izdatel'stva, al'manakhi, kruzhki v 1915 g." *Apollon* 1 (1916), 59-61.
———. "Vsevolod Kurdiumov. 'Pudrennoe serdtse.'" *Giperborei* 6 (1913), 30.
———. "V. Sirin. 'Mashen'ka,' 'Korol', dama, valet,' 'Zashchita Luzhina,' 'Vozvrashchenie Chorba.'" *Chisla* 1 (1930), 233-6.
Ivanov, Georgii, and Irina Odoevtseva. *Briefe an Vladimir Markov*. Edited by H. Rothe. Cologne: Böhlau, 1994.
Ivanov, Viacheslav. *Borozdy i mezhi*. Moscow: Musaget, 1916.
———. "Dve stikhii v sovremennom simvolizme." *Zolotoe runo* 3-4 (1908), 86-94.
———. "Estetika i ispovedanie." *Vesy* 11 (1908), 45-50.
———. "Mysli o simvolizme." *Trudy i dni* 1 (1912), 3-10.
———. "Novye maski." *Vesy* 7 (1904), 1-10.
———. "Poet i chern'." *Vesy* 3 (1904), 1-8.
———. "O 'fakel'shchikakh' i drugikh imenakh sobiratel'nykh." *Vesy* 6 (1906), 52-5.
———. "Zavety simvolizma." *Apollon* 8 (May/June 1910), 5-20.
Ivanov, Viacheslav, and Mikhail Gershenzon. *Perepiska iz dvukh uglov*. 1921. Edited by R. Bird. Moscow: Vodolei, 2006.
Ivanov-Razumnik [Razumnik Vasil'evich Ivanov, Ippolit Udush'ev]. *Chto takoe intelligentsiia*. Berlin: Skify, 1920.

———. "Dukhovnoe zaveshchanie skifa. Pis'ma R. V. Ivanova-Razumnika." Edited by V. Belous. *Zvezda* 3 (1996), 105–16.
———. *God revoliutsii*. St. Petersburg: Revoliutsionnyi sotsializm, 1918.
———. *Literatura i obshchestvennost'*. St. Petersburg: Prometei, 1911.
———. *Pered grozoi*. Petrograd: Kolos, 1923.
———. *Russkaia literatura ot semidesiatykh godov do nashikh dnei*. Berlin: Skify, 1923.
———. *Russkaia literatura XX veka (1890–1915 gg.)*. Petrograd: Kolos, 1920.
———. "*Russkaia literatura XX veka*, pod redaktsiei S. A. Vengerova." *Kniga i revoliutsiia* 5 (1920), 59–61.
———, ed. *Sovremennaia literatura*. Leningrad: Mysl', 1925.
———. *Tiur'my i ssylki*. New York: Izdatel'stvo imeni Chekhova, 1953.
———. "Tri bogatyria." *Letopis' doma literatorov* 7 (1 February 1922), 5.
———. *Tvorchestvo i kritika*. 2 vols. St. Petersburg: Prometei, 1911.
Ivanov-Razumnik and Aleksandr Blok. *Ispytanie v groze i bure*. *Skify*. *Dvenadtsat'*. Berlin: Skify, 1920.
Ivask, Iurii. "Serebrianyi vek." *Posev* 11 (13 March 1949), 11–12; 12 (20 March 1949), 11–12.
Iz glubiny. Sbornik statei o russkoi revoliutsii. 1921. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1967.
Izmailov, Aleksandr. *Pomrachenie bozhkov i novye kumiry.* Moscow: I. D. Sytin, 1910.
Johnson, Oakley. "'Chistaia propaganda' belogvardeitsev i 'nechistoe iskusstvo' sovetskikh pisatelei." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 34 (29 July 1932), 3.
Jakobson, Roman. *Language in Literature*. Edited by K. Pomorska and S. Rudy. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press, 1987.
———. *Noveishaia russkaia poeziia*. Prague: n.p., 1921.
Josephson, Matthew. *Infidel in the Temple*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1967.
Joyce, James. "Uliss (fragmenty)." Translated by S. Alymov and M. Levidov. *Literaturnaia gazeta* 20 (2 September 1929), 3.
Kakaia kniga nuzhna krest'ianinu. Moscow: Doloi negramotnost', 1927.
Kak my pishem. 1930. Moscow: Kniga, 1989.
Kanatchikov, S. "O sud'bakh poputnichestva." *Krasnaia nov'* 11 (1929), 209–17.
Karzhanskii, N. "Zarubezhnaia Rossiia." *Novyi mir* 8–9 (1926), 282–93.
Kazanskii, Boris, and Iurii Tynianov. *Mastera sovremennoi literatury. Mikhail Zoshchenko*. Leningrad: Academia, 1928. Facsimile reprint. Letchworth: Prideaux Press, 1977.
Kazmin, N. "Emigrantskie gazety." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 4 (1923), 61–72.
"K chitateliam." *Vesy* 1 (1904), iii–iv.
Kel'berin, Lazar'. "Iurii Fel'zen. 'Pis'ma o Lermontove.'" *Krug* 1 (1936), 183–5.
———. "L. F. Céline. Voyage au bout de la nuit." *Chisla* 9 (1933), 223–4.
Khlebnikov, Velimir. *Tvoreniia*. Edited by M. Poliakov, V. Grigor'ev, and A. Parnis. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987.
Khodasevich, Vladislav. "Chisla." *Vozrozhdenie* 1759 (27 March 1930), 3.

———. *Koleblemyi trenozhnik*. Edited by N. Bogomolov. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1991.
———. "Krizis poezii." *Vozrozhdenie* 3235 (12 April 1934), 3-4.
———. "Letuchie listy." *Vozrozhdenie* 1864 (10 July 1930), 3-4.
———. *Literaturnye stat'i i vospominaniia*. New York: Chekhov, 1954.
———. *Nekropol'. Literatura i vlast'. Pis'ma B. A. Sadovskomu*. Edited by N. Bogomolov. Moscow: SS, 1996.
———. "Novye stikhi." *Vozrozhdenie* 3585 (28 March 1935), 3-4.
———. "O formalizme i formalistakh." *Vozrozhdenie* 646 (10 March 1927), 2-3.
———. "O zadachakh molodoi literatury." *Vozrozhdenie* 3851 (19 December 1935), 3-4.
———. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 4 vols. Edited by I. Andreeva, S. Bocharov, and N. Bogomolov. Moscow: Soglasie, 1996-97.
———. "Zhalost' i 'zhalost'.'" *Vozrozhdenie* 3599 (11 April 1935), 3-4.
Khokhlov, German [G. Kh., Al. Novik]. "Da byl li mal'chik? . . ." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 30 (12 March 1934), 2.
———. "Iurii Fel'zen. *Obman*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 46 (1931), 499-501.
———. "Iurii Fel'zen. *Obman*." *Volia Rossii* 1-2 (1931), 198-9.
———. "V. Sirin. Zashchita Luzhina." *Sovremennye zapiski* 45 (1931), 514-17.
Khovin, Viktor. "Bezotvetnye voprosy VI-VIII." *Knizhnyi ugol* 5 (1918), 1-6.
———. "Bezotvetnye voprosy." *Knizhnyi ugol* 4 (1918), 1-5.
———. "Bezotvetnye voprosy." *Knizhnyi ugol* 6 (1919), 10-16.
———. "Modernizirovannyi Adam." *Nebokopy. Vos'moi al'manakh ego-futuristov*. St. Petersburg: Svet, 1913, 9-15.
———. "Nashi literaturnye techeniia." *Vestnik literatury* 6 (18), 1920, 1-5.
———. "Siluety russkogo dekadansa." *Ocharovannyi strannik* 2 (1913), 4-7.
Knipovich, Evgenii. "O romanakh Tynianova." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 8 (1928), 86-96.
Knut, Dovid. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 1997-98.
———. "Zelenaia lampa. Beseda III." *Novyi korabl'* 2 (1927), 41-2.
Kogan, Petr. *Ocherki po istorii noveishei russkoi literatury*. 3 vols. Moscow: Zaria, 1911-12.
———. "Russkaia literatura v gody oktiabr'skoi revoliutsii." *Krasnaia nov'* 3 (1921), 233-43.
———. "Serafimovich (1864-1924)." *Na postu* 1 (1924), 139-50.
Korolenko, Vladimir. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 10 vols. Moscow: GIKhL, 1955.
Kovarskii, Nikolai. "Spor o iazyke." *Literaturnyi sovremennik* 4 (1934), 107-20.
"K priezdu N. M. Minskogo." *Dnevniki pisatelei* 1 (1914), 41-4.
Krandievskaia, Anastasiia, and O. Mirtov [Ol'ga Kopylëva]. "Dva pis'ma." *Rossiia* 5 (1925), 296-302.

Kruchenykh, Aleksei. *Zaumnyi iazyk u. Seifullinoi, Vs. Ivanova, Leonova, Babelia, I. Sel'vinskogo, A. Veselogo i dr*. Moscow: Izdanie Vserossiiskogo Soiuza Poetov, 1925.

Krylova, S., L. Lebedinskii, Ra-Be [A. Bek], and L. Toom, eds. *Rabochie o literature, teatre i muzyke*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1926.

Kuda my idem? Sbornik statei i otvetov. Moscow: Zaria, 1910.

Kuprin, Aleksandr. "Moi geroi—pravda." 1926. *Literaturnoe obozrenie* 4 (1998), 66–7.

Kurella, Al'fred. "Khudozhestvennaia reaktsiia pod maskoi 'geroicheskogo realizma.'" *Revoliutsiia i kul'tura* 2 (1928), 42–7.

Kursinskii, Aleksandr. "L. Andreev. Tom II: Rasskazy. Tom III: Melkie rasskazy." *Zolotoe runo* 5 (1906), 84–7.

Kuzmin, Mikhail. *Dnevnik 1908–1915*. Edited by N. Bogomolov and S. Shumikhin. St. Petersburg: Ivan Limbakh, 2005.

———. *Dnevnik 1934 goda*. Edited by G. Morev. St. Petersburg: Ivan Limbakh, 1998.

———. "Futuristy." *Apollon* 9 (1910), 20–1.

———. "Khudozhestvennaia proza 'Vesov.'" *Apollon* 9 (1910), 35–41.

———. "Pis'mo v redaktsiiu." *Apollon* 5 (1912), 56–7.

———. "Stikhotvoreniia. P'esa. Perepiska," edited by A. Timofeev. In *Ezhegodnik rukopisnogo otdela Pushkinskogo doma na 1990 god*. Edited by T. Tsar'kova. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1993, 37–71.

———. "Zametki o russkoi belletristike." *Apollon* 11 (1910), 49–50.

Kuznetsov, M. "Sotsialisticheskii realizm i modernizm." *Novyi mir* 8 (1963), 220–45.

Lalou, René. *Histoire de la littérature française contemporaine*. Paris: Crès, 1924.

Leavis, Frank Raymond. *Mass Civilization and Minority Culture*. Cambridge: Minority Press, 1930.

Leavis, Queenie Dorothy. *Fiction and the Reading Public*. London: Chatto & Windus, 1932.

"Lef i MAPP." *LEF* 4 (1924), 3.

Leiris, Michel. *L'Âge d'homme*. Paris: Gallimard, 1995.

Lelevich, G. "Mezhdu formalizmom i sotsiologizmom." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 6 (1928), 175–80.

———. "Nam nuzhna partiinaia liniia." *Na postu* 1 (1923), 101–8.

———. "Snova o nashikh literaturnykh raznoglasiiakh." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 8 (1925), 69–88.

———. "Vladimir Maiakovskii." *Na postu* 1 (1923), 133–48.

Levidov, Mikhail. "I. A. Bunin." *Novyi zhurnal dlia vsekh* 4–6 (1916), 42–8.

———. "Organizovannoe uproshchenie kul'tury." *Krasnaia nov'* 1 (1923), 306–18.

Levin, F. "Vyzhech' do kontsa." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 12 (5 March 1937), 2.

Lezhnev, Abram. "Khudozhestvennaia literatura." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 7 (1927), 81–118.

———. *O literature*. Edited by G. Belaia and M. Kominarskaia. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1987.

Lisitskii, El, and Il'ia Erenburg. Editorial. *Veshch'* 1–2 (1922), 1–4.
"Literatura ne kormit." *Poslednie novosti* 3207 (2 January 1930), 3.
Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Vol. 1. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Kommunisticheskoi Akademii, 1929.
Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Vol. 9. Moscow: OGIZ, 1935.
Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Vol. 10. Munich: Otto Sagner, 1991.
Literaturnaia entsiklopediia. Slovar' literaturnykh terminov. 2 vols. Moscow: L. Frenkel', 1925. Facsimile reprint. Tokyo, Nauka, 1979.
Literaturnyi raspad. Kriticheskii sbornik. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'skoe biuro, 1908.
Literaturnyi raspad. Kriticheskii sbornik. Kniga vtoraia. St. Petersburg: EOS, 1909.
Liubosh, Semën. "Literatura griadushchego dnia." *Vestnik literatury* 8 (1919), 2–3.
Livshits, Benedikt. *Polutoraglazyi strelets*. 1933. Edited by A. Parnis. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1991.
Loks, Konstantin. "Sovremennaia proza." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 5 (1923), 82–6; 7 (1923), 75–81.
Lormel, Louis. "Les Débuts du symbolisme littéraire." *La Connaissance* 6 (1920), 603–8; 8 (1920), 755–9; 10 (1920), 983–6.
Luknitskii, Pavel. *Vstrechi s Annoi Akhmatovoi*. Vol. 1. Paris: YMCA-Press, 1991.
Lunacharskii, Anatolii. *Ot Spinozy do Marksa*. Moscow: Novaia Moskva, 1925.
———. *Religiia i sotsializm*. 2 vols. St. Petersburg: Shipovnik, 1908–11.
———. *Stat'i o sovetskoi literature*. Moscow: Prosveshchenie, 1971.
———. "Zametki o zhurnalakh.—Dom Iskusstv." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 2 (1921), 224–7.
Lunts, Lev. "Pochemu my Serapionovy Brat'ia." *Literaturnye zapiski* 3 (1 August 1922), 30–1.
———. "Tsekh poetov." *Knizhnyi ugol* 8 (1922), 48–54.
Luppol, I., M. Rozental', and S. Tret'iakov, eds. *Pervyi vsesoiuznyi s''ezd sovetskikh pisatelei. Stenograficheskii otchet*. 1934. Facsimile reprint. Moscow, Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.
Lur'e, Artur. "Muzyka Stravinskogo." *Versty* 1 (1926), 119–35.
———. "Puti russkoi shkoly." *Chisla* 7–8 (1933), 218–29.
Lur'e, Vera. "V. Sirin. *Gornii put'*." *Novaia russkaia kniga* 1 (1923), 23.
L'vov-Rogachevskii, Vasilii. "Byt' ili ne byt' russkomu simvolizmu?" *Sovremennyi mir* (1910), 76–86.
———. *Noveishaia russkaia literatura*. Moscow: VTsSPO-Tsentrosoiuz, 1922–23.
———. "Simvolisty i nasledniki ikh." *Sovremennik* 6 (1913), 261–79; 7 (1913), 298–307.
———. "Vchera, segodnia i veroiatnoe zavtra russkoi literatury." *Sovremennik* 1 (1914), 119–30.
Machajski, Jan Wacław [A. Vol'skii]. *Umstvennyi rabochii*. 1904–5. New York: Mezhdunarodnoe literaturnoe sodruzhestvo, 1968.
Maiakovskii, Vladimir. "Nekrolog.—V. V. Khlebnikov." *Krasnaia nov'* 4 (1922), 303–6.
Maiakovskii, Vladimir, and Osip Brik. "Nasha slovesnaia rabota." *LEF* 1 (1923), 40–1.

Maiskii, I. "O kul'ture, literature i kommunisticheskoi partii." *Zvezda* 3 (1924), 258–79.
Makovskii, Sergei. "Dusha reaktsii i sviatoe bespokoistvo." *Apollon* 6 (1913), 44–7.
———. *Na Parnase "Serebrianogo veka."* Munich: TsOPE, 1962.
Malakhov, S. "Teoriia konstruktivizma." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 4 (1929), 54–62.
Mandel'shtam, Iurii. "Dnevnik obmanutogo cheloveka." *Vozrozhdenie* 3557 (28 February 1935), 4.
———. "Smert' v kredit." *Vozrozhdenie* 4035 (18 July 1936), 5.
Mandel'shtam, Nadezhda. *Vospominaniia*. Moscow: Soglasie, 1999.
———. *Vtoraia kniga*. Moscow: Soglasie, 1999.
Mandel'shtam, Osip. "Andrei Belyi. *Zapiski chudaka*." *Krasnaia nov'* 5 (1923), 399–400.
———. "Armiia poetov." *Ogonek* 33 (11 November 1923), 12; 34 (18 November 1923), 13–16.
———. "Slovo i kul'tura." *Tsekh poetov* 1 (1922), 81–9.
———. *Sochineniia*. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1990.
Markov, Vladimir, ed. *Manifesty i programmy russkikh futuristov*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1967.
Maslin, M., et al., eds. *O Rossii i russkoi filosofskoi kul'ture*. Moscow: Nauka, 1990.
Maslin, N. "Dekadenty ili klassiki." *Literaturnyi sovremennik* 9 (1935), 163–7.
Medvedev, Pavel. *Formalizm i formalisty*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo pisatelei, 1934. Facsimile reprint. Hildesheim: Georg Olms Verlag, 1973.
———. *Pamiati Akima L'vovicha Volynskogo*. Leningrad: Vserossiiskii Soiuz Pisatelei, 1928.
———. "Uchenyi sal'erizm. O formal'nom (morfologicheskom) metode." *Zvezda* 3 (1925), 264–76.
Meierkhol'd, Vsevolod. "Iz pisem o teatre." *Vesy* 6 (1907), 93–8.
Merezhkovskii, Dmitrii. *Bylo i budet. Dnevnik. 1910–1914. Nevoennyi dnevnik. 1914–1916*. Edited by E. Domogatskaia. Moscow: Agraf, 2001.
———. "Dekadentstvo i obshchestvennost'." *Vesy* 5 (1906), 30–7.
———. *Izbrannye stat'i*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink, 1972.
———. *L. Tolstoi i Dostoevskii. Vechnye sputniki*. Moscow: Respublika, 1995.
———. "Meshchanstvo i russkaia intelligentsiia." *Poliarnaia zvezda* 1 (15 December 1905), 32–42.
———. "O Chekhove." *Vesy* 11 (1905), 1–26.
———. *V tikhom omute. Stat'i i issledovaniia raznykh let*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1991.
Meshcheriakov, N. "Nashi za granitsei." *Krasnaia nov'* 1 (1921), 275–85.
Metner, Emil' [Vol'fing]. *Modernizm i muzyka*. Moscow: Musaget, 1912.
Mikh. "My stroim sotsialisticheskuiu literaturu. Vystuplenie L. Averbakha." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 19 (23 April 1932), 2.

Mikhailovskii, Boris. *Russkaia literatura XX veka. S devianostykh godov XIX veka do 1917 g*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe uchebno-pedagogicheskoe izdatel'stvo, 1939.
Mikhailovskii, Nikolai. *Literaturnaia kritika i vospominaniia*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1995.
Miliukov, Pavel. *Ocherki po istorii russkoi kul'tury*. 3 vols. Moscow: Progress-Kul'tura, 1994.
———. *Vospominaniia*. 2 vols. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1990.
Miller-Budnitskaia, Rashel'. "Ob 'Ulisse' Dzheimsa Dzhoisa." *Literaturnyi kritik* 1 (1934), 162–79.
Minskii, Nikolai. "Iz zapisnoi knizhki." *Dnevniki pisatelei* 2 (1914), 24–5.
———. *Na obshchestvennye temy*. St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1909.
———. "Narod i intelligentsiia." *Russkaia mysl'* 19 (1909), 99–110.
———. *Religiia budushchego*. St. Petersburg: M. V. Pirozhkov, 1905.
Mirskii, Dmitrii [Mirsky, Sviatopolk-Mirskii]. *Contemporary Russian Literature, 1881–1925*. London: Routledge, 1926.
———. "Dos-Passos, sovetskaia literatura i Zapad." *Literaturnyi kritik* 1 (1933), 111–26.
———. "I. Babel'. Rasskazy." *Sovremennye zapiski* 26 (1925), 485–8.
———. *Intellidzhentsia*. Moscow: Sovetskaia literatura, 1934.
———. "Konst. Fedin. *Goroda i gody*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 24 (1925), 432–4.
———. *The Letters of D. S. Mirsky to P. P. Suvchinksii*. Edited by G. Smith. Birmingham: University of Birmingham, 1995.
———. "Literaturnaia Rossiia. Sbornik sovremennoi russkoi prozy." *Sovremennye zapiski* 23 (1925), 473–5.
———. "O nyneshnem sostoianii russkoi literatury." *Blagonamerennyi* 1 (1926), 90–7.
———. *Uncollected Writings on Russian Literature*. Edited by G. Smith. Berkeley: Berkeley Slavic Specialties, 1989.
———. "Valerii Iakovlevich Briusov." *Sovremennye zapiski* 22 (1924), 414–26.
———. "Voprosy poezii." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 35 (24 June 1935), 3.
Mochul'skii, Konstantin. "Klassitsizm v sovremennoi russkoi poezii." *Sovremennye zapiski* 11 (1922), 368–79.
———. "Krizis voobrazheniia." *Zveno* 2 (1 August 1927), 75–81.
———. "Lirika Sologuba." *Zveno* 58 (10 March 1924), 2.
———. "Literaturnye besedy." *Zveno* 107 (16 February 1925), 2.
———. "Novaia proza." *Zveno* 201 (5 December 1926), 1–2.
———. "O literaturnoi kritike." *Zveno* 41 (12 November 1923), 2.
———. "'Poslednee svidanie' I. A. Bunina." *Zveno* 223 (8 May 1927), 2–3.
"Le Modernisme." *La Revue moderniste* 1 (1884), 3–6.
Muratov, Pavel. "Iskusstvo prozy." *Sovremennye zapiski* 29 (1926), 240–58.
———. "O vysokom khudozhestve." *Zolotoe runo* 11–12 (1907), 75–84.
Mustangov, E. "O 'levoi fraze' tov. Arvatova i putiakh proletarskoi literatury." *Zvezda* 6 (1925), 319–27.

Mustangova, K. "Poeticheskie traditsii." *Literaturnyi Leningrad* 2 (8 January 1936), 1–2.

"My dozhdemsia svoei kritiki!" *Revoliutsiia i kul'tura* 3–4 (1928), 38–44.

Nabokov, Vladimir. *Eugene Onegin: A Novel in Verse by Aleksandr Pushkin; Translated from the Russian, with a Commentary, by Vladimir Nabokov*. 4 vols. New York: Pantheon Books, 1964.

———. *The Gift*. Translated by Michael Scammel. New York: Vintage International, 1991.

———. *The Real Life of Sebastian Knight*. New York: Vintage International, 1992.

———. *Selected Letters, 1940–1977*. Edited by D. Nabokov and M. Bruccoli. San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovic, 1989.

———. *Sobranie sochinenii russkogo perioda*. 5 vols. St. Petersburg: Simpozium, 2000.

Nabokov, Vladimir, and Edmund Wilson. *The Nabokov-Wilson Letters*. Edited by S. Karlinsky. New York: Harper & Row, 1979.

Nikitina, Evdokiia. *Russkaia literatura ot simvolizma do nashikh dnei*. Moscow: Nikitinskie subbotniki, 1926.

Nikolaev, P., ed. *Razvitie realizma v russkoi literature*. Vol. 3: *Svoeobrazie kriticheskogo realizma kontsa XIX-nachala XX veka*. Moscow: Nauka, 1974.

Nikulin, Lev. "Razgovor s mertvetsami." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 104 (17 August 1934), 8.

Nurok, Al'fred [N-k]. "Vystavki 'setsessionistov' v Berline i Vene." *Mir iskusstva* 15 (1899), 14–16.

Nusinov, Isaak. " 'Maski' v maske. Ob Andree Belom." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 20 (29 April 1933), 3.

Oksenov, Innokentii. "Pis'ma o sovremennoi poezii." *Kniga i revoliutsiia* 1 (1921), 30–1.

———. "Sovetskaia poeziia i nasledstvo akmeizma." *Literaturnyi Leningrad* 24 (26 May 1934), 3.

Oksman, Iulii, and Kornei Chukovskii. *Perepiska*. Edited by A. Grishunin. Moscow: Iazyki slavianskoi kul'tury, 2001.

Olesha, Iurii. *Kniga proshchaniia*. Moscow: Vagrius, 1999.

Orlov, Vladimir. "Iz literaturnogo nasledstva Aleksandra Bloka. II. Aleksandr Blok i Andrei Belyi v 1907 godu." *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 27–28. Moscow: Zhurnal'no-gazetnoe ob'edinenie, 1937, 371–408.

Ortega y Gasset, José. *The Dehumanization of Art and Other Writings on Art and Culture*. New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1956.

"O Russkoi zarubezhnoi akademii." *Vstrechi* 1 (1934), 35.

Osorgin, Mikhail. "Rossiiskie pisateli o sebe." *Sovremennye zapiski* 21 (1924), 365–75.

———. "Rossiiskie zhurnaly." *Sovremennye zapiski* 22 (1924), 426–33.

———. "Vladimir Maiakovskii. Dlia golosa." *Sovremennye zapiski* 22 (1924), 455–6.

———. "V. Sirin. Kamera Obscura." *Sovremennye zapiski* 54 (1934), 458–60.

"Ot redaktsii." *Chet i nechet. Al'manakh poezii i kritiki*. Moscow: n.p., 1925, 5.

"Ot redaktsii." *Chisla* 1 (1930), 5-7.
"Ot redaktsii." *Giperborei* 1 (1912), 3-4.
"Ot redaktsii." *Pereval* 1 (1906), 3-4.
"Ot redaktsii." *Trudy i dni* 1 (1912), 1-2.
"Ot redaktsii." *Versty* 1 (1926), 6.
"Ot redaktsii." *Vesy* 12 (1909), 185-91.
"Ot redaktsii." *Zolotoe runo* 11-12 (1909), 105-7.
Otsup, Nikolai. "Iz dnevnika." *Chisla* 10 (1934), 200-3.
———. "Klim Samgin." *Chisla* 7-8 (1933), 178-83.
———. "Ob Andree Belom." *Chisla* 4 (1930-31), 212-14.
———. "O poezii i poetakh." *Chisla* 6 (1932), 133-44.
———. "Serebrianyi vek." *Chisla* 7-8 (1933), 174-8.
———. *Sovremenniki*. Paris: n.p., 1961.
Ovsianiko-Kulikovskii, Dmitrii. *Istoriia russkoi intelligentsii*. Moscow: V. M. Sablin, 1908.
Pant-ov, M. "Sbornik tovarishchestva 'Znanie' za 1903 god." *Vesy* 5 (1904), 52-3.
Pasternak, Boris. *Vozdushnye puti. Proza raznykh let*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1982.
"Pchely i osy Apollona. Nashi kritiki v tsitatakh." *Apollon* 3 (1909), 62-5.
"Pchely i osy Apollona. Skuchnyi razgovor." *Apollon* 1 (1909), 79-84.
Pentaur. "L. Gurevich. *Sedok i drugie rasskazy*." *Vesy* 8 (1904), 55-6.
———. "*Ocherki realisticheskogo mirovozzreniia*." *Vesy* 2 (1904), 74-5.
Pertsov, Pëtr. *Literaturnye vospominaniia 1890-1902 gg*. 1933. Edited by A. Lavrov. Moscow: NLO, 2002.
Pertsov, Viktor. "Grafik sovremennogo Lefa." *Novyi LEF* 1 (1927), 15-19.
———. "Marksizm(y) v literaturovedenii." *Novyi LEF* 7 (1928), 24-31.
———. "Vymyshlennaia figura." *Na postu* 1 (1924), 209-24.
Petrishchev, A. "Zabytaia godovshchina." *Literaturnye zapiski* 1 (25 May 1922), 1-3.
Piast, Vladimir. *Vstrechi*. Moscow: Federatsiia, 1929.
Piatakov, Georgii. "Filosofiia sovremennogo imperializma." *Krasnaia nov'* 3 (1922), 182-97.
Pil'skii, Pëtr. "Iurii Fel'zen. Obman." *Chisla* 4 (1930), 267-9.
———. *Problema pola, polovye avtory i polovoi geroi*. St. Petersburg: Osvobozhdenie, 1909.
Plekhanov, Georgii. *Literatura i estetika*. 2 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1958.
Polianskii, Valerian. "Kto zhe iavliaetsia proletarskim pisatelem?" *Krasnaia nov'* 3 (1929), 198-200.
"Politika i iskusstvo. Vecher 'Chisel.'" *Chisla* 4 (1930-31), 259-61.
Polonskii, Viacheslav. "Khudozhestvennoe tvorchestvo i obshchestvennye klassy." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 2-3 (1929), 5-36.
———. *O literature*. Edited by V. Eidinova. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1988.
———. *O sovremennoi literature*. Moscow: Gosizdat, 1929.

———. "Preodolenie 'Zavisti.'" *Novyi mir* 5 (1929), 189–208.
———. "Zametki o kul'ture i nekul'turnosti." *Krasnaia nov'* 3 (1923), 268–80.
Pomorska, Krystyna. *Russian Formalist Theory and Its Poetic Ambiance*. The Hague: Mouton, 1968.
Poplavskii, Boris. "Literaturnaia anketa." *Chisla* 5 (1931), 287.
———. "Molodaia russkaia zhivopis' v Parizhe." *Chisla* 1 (1930), 192–6.
———. "O misticheskoi atmosfere molodoi literatury v emigratsii." *Chisla* 2–3 (1930), 308–11.
———. "O smerti i zhalosti v 'Chislakh.'" *Novaia gazeta* 3 (1 April 1931), 3.
———. "Vokrug 'Chisel.'" *Chisla* 10 (1934), 204–9.
———. "Zametki o poezii." *Stikhotvorenie* 2 (1928), 28–9.
Pound, Ezra. "Harold Monro." *Criterion* 45 (1932), 581–92.
———. *Pound/Joyce*. Edited by F. Read. New York: New Directions, 1967.
———. "Small Magazines." *English Journal* 9 (1930), 689–704.
Poves, S., and L. Kogan, eds. *Modernisty, ikh predshestvenniki i kriticheskaia literatura o nikh*. Odessa: Biblioteka O-va vzaimnogo vspomoshchestvovaniia prikazchikov-evreev, 1908.
Prishvin, Mikhail. *Dnevniki 1918–1919*. Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1994.
———. *Dnevniki 1923–1925*. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 1999.
———. *Dnevniki 1928–1929*. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 2004.
———. *Dnevniki 1930–1931*. St. Petersburg: Rostok, 2006.
———. *Dnevniki 1938–1939*. St. Petersburg: Rostok, 2010.
———. *Rannii dnevnik*. St. Petersburg: Rostok, 2007.
———. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 8 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1983.
Problemy tipologii russkogo realizma. Moscow: Nauka, 1969.
"Programma. Za chto boretsia LEF?" *LEF* 1 (1923), 3–7.
Protiv burzhuaznogo liberalizma v khudozhestvennoi literature. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo Kommunisticheskoi Akademii, 1931.
"Protiv burzhuaznykh tribunov pod maskoi sovetskogo pisatelia. Protiv pereklichki s beloi emigratsiei." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 20 (2 September 1929), 1.
"Protiv pereklichki s emigrantshchinoi." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 21 (9 September 1929), 2.
Puni, Ivan. "Sovremennye gruppirovki v russkom levom iskusstve." *Iskusstvo kommuny* 19 (13 April 1919), 2–3.
Punin, Nikolai. *Mir svetel liubov'iu. Dnevniki. Pis'ma*. Edited by L. Zykov. Moscow: Artist, rezhisser, teatr, 2000.
———. "O forme i soderzhanii." *Iskusstvo kommuny* 18 (6 April 1918), 1.
Radakov, Aleksei. "Kak ia stal geniem (Po M. Voloshinu)." *Satirikon* 1 (1908), 9.
Radlov, Nikolai. *O futurizme*. Petrograd: Akvilon, 1923.
Radek, Karl. "Kul'tura rozhdaiushchegosia sotsializma." *Izvestiia* 273 (7 November 1933), 2.

Raevskii, Georgii, "O russkoi trevoge i nemetskoi Sensucht." *Vozrozhdenie* 1297 (20 December 1928), 4.

Raevsky-Hughes, Olga, ed. *Vstrecha s emigratsiei. Iz perepiski Ivanova-Razumnika 1942–1946 godov*. Moscow: Russkii put'-YMCA Press, 2001.

Red'ko, Aleksandr. *Literaturno-khudozhestvennye iskaniia v kontse XIX–nachale XX vv*. Leningrad: Seiatel', 1924.

———. "U podnozhiia afrikanskogo idola. Simvolizm. Akmeizm. Ego-futurizm." *Russkoe Bogatstvo* 6 (1913), 317–32; 7 (1913), 179–99.

Reikh, B. "Marsel' Prust." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 8 (1927), 109–14.

Reisner, Mikhail. "Bogema i kul'turnaia revoliutsiia." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 5 (1928), 81–96.

Remizov, Aleksei. *Izbrannoe*. Edited by A. Danilevskii. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 1991.

———. *Vzvikhrennaia Rus'*. 1927. Edited by A. Kozin. London: Overseas, 1979.

"Revoliutsiia dukha." *Biulleteni literatury i zhizni* 6 (1918), 6–15.

Reznikov, Daniil. "Chto budet s nashei literaturoi?" *Novaia gazeta* 1 (1 March 1931), 4.

Riding, Laura, and Robert Graves. *A Survey of Modernist Poetry*. 1927. London: William Heinemann, 1929.

Rimbaud, Arthur. *Poésies. Une saison en enfer. Illuminations*. Edited by L. Forestier. Paris: Gallimard, 1994.

Rivera, Diego. "AkhRR i stil' proletarskogo revoliutsionnogo iskusstva." *Revoliutsiia i kul'tura* 6 (1928), 43–4.

Rivière, Jacques. "La Crise du concepte de littérature." *Nouvelle revue française* 75 (1924), 159–70.

Romashov, Boris. "Unichtozhit' vragov, iskorenit' manilovshchinu." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 48 (27 August 1936), 4.

Rostislavov, Aleksandr. "O shkolakh." *Mir iskusstva* 1 (1904), 18–19.

Rozanov, Vasilii. *Dekadenty*. St. Petersburg: n.p., 1904.

———. *Mysli o literature*. Moscow: Sovremennik, 1989.

Rozhdestvenskii, Vsevolod. "Peterburgskaia shkola molodoi russkoi poezii." *Zapiski peredvizhnogo teatra* 62 (7 October 1923), 1–3.

Rudnev, Vadim. "Novyi Grad." *Sovremennye zapiski* 48 (1932), 504–9.

Rusov, Nikolai. "Andrei Belyi i sotsial-demokratiia." *Pereval* 10 (1907), 38–42.

Russkaia kritika sovremennoi literatury. Kharakteristiki, obraztsy, portrety. St. Petersburg: Vestnik Znaniia, 1912.

Sadovskoi, Boris. "Konets akmeizma." *Sovremennik* 13–15 (1914), 230–1.

Saianov, Vissarion. *Ot klassikov k sovremennosti*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1929.

———. *Sovremennye literaturnye gruppirovki*. Leningrad: Priboi, 1930.

Samarin, Roman, Mikhail Khrapchenko, and Iakov El'sberg, eds. *Realizm i ego otnosheniia s drugimi tvorcheskimi metodami*. Moscow: AN SSSR, 1962.

Samartsev, K. "Po tu storonu grani." *Pechat' i revoliutsiia* 4 (1927), 111–19.

Schmitt, Carl. *Political Romanticism*. Translated by G. Oakes. New Brunswick: Transaction, 2011.

Selivanovskii, Aleksei. "Dary burzhuaznoi kul'tury." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 13 (29 February 1936), 2.

———. "Khudozhnik neizvesten." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 1 (4 January 1932), 2.

———. *Ocherki po istorii russkoi sovetskoi poezii*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1936.

———. "V zashchitu sovetskoi poezii." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 41 (20 July 1936), 4.

Séménoff, Eugène [Evgenii Semënov]. "Le Mysticisme anarchique." *Le Mercure de France* 242 (16 July 1907), 361–4.

Serafimovich, Aleksandr. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 7 vols. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1959.

Shaginian, Marietta. *Literaturnyi dnevnik*. Petrograd: Parfenon, 1922.

Shaginian, Marietta, and Leopol'd Averbakh. *Pisatel' bolen?* Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1927.

Shapirshtein-Lers, Iakov. *Obshchestvennyi smysl russkogo literaturnogo futurizma*. Moscow: A. G. Mironov, 1922.

Sharshun, Sergei. "Magicheskii realism." *Chisla* 6 (1932), 229–31.

Shaw, Bernard. *Major Critical Essays*. London: Constable, 1955.

Shemshurin, Andrei. *Futurizm v stikhakh V. Briusova*. Moscow: n.p., 1913.

Shklovskii, Viktor. *Gamburgskii schet*. St. Petersburg: Limbus Press, 2000.

———. *Khod konia*. Moscow: Gelikon, 1923. Facsimile reprint. Moscow: Sol', 1999.

———. "Ob iskusstve i revoliutsii." *Iskusstvo kommuny* 17 (30 March 1919), 2.

———. "Pamiatnik nauchnoi oshibke." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 4 (27 January 1930), 1.

———. "Pis'ma M. Gor'komu 1917–1923 gg." Edited by A. Galushkin. *De Visu* 1 (1993), 28–46.

———. "Pis'mo k Romanu Iakobsonu." *Knizhnyi ugol* 8 (1922), 23–4.

———. *Poiski optimizma*. Moscow: Federatsiia, 1931.

———. *Rozanov*. Petrograd: OPOIaZ, 1921. Facsimile reprint. Letchworth: Prideaux Press, 1974.

———. *Sentimental'noe puteshestvie*. 1923. Moscow: Novosti, 1990.

———. *Tekhnika pisatel'skogo remesla*. Moscow: Molodaia gvardiia, 1927.

Shletser, Boris. "O modernistakh." *Zveno* 40 (5 November 1923), 2–3.

———. "'Znamia.' Vremennik literatury i politiki." *Sovremennye zapiski* 7 (1921), 402–8.

Shteinberg, Aaron. *Druz'ia moikh rannikh let (1911–1928)*. Edited by G. Nivat. Paris: Sintaksis, 1991.

Shteinman, Zelik. "Novye vremena—starye pesni." *Zvezda* 5 (1929), 154–50.

Shvarts, Evgenii. *Zhivu bespokoino . . . Iz dnevnikov*. Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1990.

Skabichevskii, Aleksandr. "Novye techeniia v sovremennoi literature." *Russkaia mysl'* 11 (1901), 81–100.

Slonim, Mark. "Desiat' let russkoi literatury." *Volia Rossii* 10 (1927), 61–75; 11–12 (1927), 92–119.
———. "Fëdor Sologub." *Volia Rossii* 11–12 (1927), 278–83.
———. "I. Babel'." *Volia Rossii* 1 (1928), 106–17.
———. "Literatura emigratsii." *Volia Rossii* 4 (1925), 182–92.
———. "Literaturnyi dnevnik.—O literaturnoi kritike v emigratsii.—Molodye russkie poety za rubezhom." *Volia Rossii* 7 (1928), 58–75.
———. "Master anekdota (Ob Al. Tolstom)." *Volia Rossii* 12–13 (1924), 160–9.
———. "Molodye pisateli za rubezhom." *Volia Rossii* 10–11 (1929), 100–18.
———. "O sovremennoi literature." *Volia Rossii* 5–6 (1927), 114–30.
———. *Portrety sovetskikh pisatelei*. Paris: Parabola, 1933.
———. "Serapionovy brat'ia." *Volia Rossii* 1 (1922), 46–54.
———. "Zametki ob emigrantskoi literature." *Volia Rossii* 7–9 (1931), 616–27.
"Smes'." *Apollon* 1 (1913), 70–1.
Smirnov, I. "Sborniki tovarishchestva 'Znanie' za 1904 g." *Vesy* 4 (1905), 47–50.
Smirnov, Nikolai. "Na tom beregu. Zametki ob emigrantskoi literature." *Novyi mir* 6 (1926), 141–50.
———. "Solntse mertvykh." *Krasnaia nov'* 3 (1924), 250–67.
"Soglashenie Mosk. Assotsiatsii Prolet. Pisatelei MAPP i gruppy LEF." *LEF* 4 (1924), 4–5.
Sologub, Fëdor. *Melkii bes*. Edited by M. Pavlova. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 2004.
———. *Tvorimaia legenda*. 1914. Facsimile reprint. Munich, Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1972.
———. "Zametki." *Dnevniki pisatelei* 1 (1914), 12–18.
———. "Zametki." *Dnevniki pisatelei* 3–4 (1914), 57–61.
Solov'ev, Sergei. "Ivan Bunin. *Stikhotvoreniia*." *Zolotoe runo* 1 (1907), 89.
———. "M. Kuzmin. *Komedii*." *Vesy* 3 (1909), 93–5.
———. "Simvolizm i dekadentstvo." *Vesy* 5 (May 1909), 53–6.
Solov'ev, Vladimir. *Stikhotvoreniia. Estetika. Literaturnaia kritika*. Edited by N. Kotrelev. Moscow: Kniga, 1990.
Sosinskii, Bronislav. "Fëdor Sologub." *Stikhotvorenie* 1 (1928), 11–14.
Startsev, Abel'. "Dzheims Dzhois." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 19 (31 March 1936), 5.
———. "Eksperiment v sovremennoi burzhuaznoi literature." *Literaturnyi kritik* 6 (1934), 57–79.
Stasov, Vladimir. *Izbrannye sochineniia*. 3 vols. Ed. E. Stasova et al. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1952.
Stepun, Fëdor. *Byvshee i nesbyvsheesia*. 1956. Moscow: Progress-Aleteiia, 1995.
———. "I. A. Bunin (Po povodu 'Mitinoi liubvi')." *Sovremennye zapiski* 27 (1926), 323–45.
———. "Po povodu pis'ma N. A. Berdiaeva." *Sovremennye zapiski* 24 (1925), 304–20.
———. "Porevoliutsionnoe soznanie i zadacha emigrantskoi literatury." *Novyi Grad* 10 (1935), 12–28.

Stikhotvorenie. Poeziia i poeticheskaia kritika. Vol. 1. Paris: n.p., 1928.
Struve, Gleb. "The Aesthetic Function in Russian Literature." *Slavic Review* 21.3 (1962), 418–27.
———. *Soviet Russian Literature 1917–50*. Norman: U of Oklahoma P, 1951.
———. *25 Years of Soviet Russian Literature (1918–1943)*. London: Routledge, 1944.
Struve, Pëtr. "Pochemu zastoialas' nasha dukhovnaia zhizn'." *Russkaia mysl'* 3 (1914), 106–18.
———. "Religiia i sotsializm." *Russkaia mysl'* 8 (1909), 148–56.
Le Studio franco-russe, 1929–1931. Edited by L. Livak and G. Tassis. Toronto: Toronto Slavic Library, 2005.
Sventitskii, Andrei. "Bolezn' russkoi poezii." *Vestnik literatury* 11 (35), 1921, 8.
Symons, Arthur. *The Symbolist Movement in Literature*. 1899. New York: E. P. Dutton, 1958.
Tal'nikov, David. "Literaturnye zametki." *Krasnaia nov'* 2 (1929), 189–99.
———. "'Simvolizm' ili realism?" *Sovremennyi mir* 4 (1914), 124–48.
Talov, Mark. *Vospominaniia. Stikhi. Perevody*. Edited by M. Talova et al. Moscow: MIK-Al'batros, 2005.
Tasteven, Genrikh [Empirik]. *Futurizm (Na puti k novomu simvolizmu)*. Moscow: Iris, 1914.
———. "Prichiny odnoi literaturnoi metamorfozy." *Zolotoe runo* 4 (1907), 79–80.
Terapiano, Iurii. "Chelovek 30-kh godov." *Chisla* 7–8 (1933), 210–12.
———. "Iu. Fel'zen. 'Schast'e.'" *Chisla* 7–8 (1933), 267–9.
———. *Literaturnaia zhizn' russkogo Parizha*. Edited by R. Guerra and A. Glezer. Paris: Al'batros-Tret'ia volna, 1987.
———. "Na Balkanakh." *Chisla* 9 (1933), 139–40.
———. "Okol'nye puti." *Novyi dom* 3 (1927), 34–6.
———. *Vstrechi*. New York: Izdatel'stvo imeni Chekhova, 1953.
———. "Zhurnal i chitatel'." *Novyi korabl'* 1 (1927), 23–6.
Terent'ev, Igor'. *Sobranie sochinenii*. Edited by M. Marzaduri and T. Nikol'skaia. Bologna: S. Francesco, 1988.
Thibaudet, Albert. *Histoire de la littérature française de 1789 à nos jours*. Paris: Stock, 1936.
Toporkov, A. "O novom realizme (Boris Zaitsev)." *Zolotoe runo* 10 (1907), 46–9.
Toporov, A. *Krest'iane o pisateliakh*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1930.
Toropetskii, L. "Povorot k intelligentsii." *Russkie zapiski* 15 (1939), 147–57.
"Torzhestvuiushchii oboz." *Veshch'* 3 (1922), 2.
Tret'iakov, Sergei. "B'em trevogu." *Novyi LEF* 2 (1927), 1–5.
———. "Otkuda i kuda?" *LEF* 1 (1923), 192–203.
———. "Prodolzhenie sleduet." *Novyi LEF* 12 (1928), 1–4.
———. "Tribuna Lefa." *LEF* 3 (1923), 154–64.
Trotskii, Lev. "Diktatura, gde tvoi khlyst?" *Pravda* 121 (2 June 1922), 1.

———. *Literatura i revoliutsiia*. 1923. Moscow: Izdatel'stvo politicheskoi literatury, 1991.
Tsetlin, Mikhail. "Emigrantskoe." *Sovremennye zapiski* 32 (1927), 435–41.
———. "Iurii Fel'zen. *Schast'e*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 51 (1933), 459–61.
———. "Ivan Bunin. *Roza Ierikhona*." *Sovremennye zapiski* 22 (1924), 449–51.
———. "Literaturnye zametki. Grazhdanskaia voina v literature." *Sovremennye zapiski* 30 (1927), 514–20.
———. "Mikh. Bulgakov. Dni Turbinykh (Belaia Gvardiia)." *Sovremennye zapiski* 23 (1927), 528–30.
———. "Plemia mladoe." *Sovremennye zapiski* 12 (1922), 329–38.
———. "V. Sirin. Korol', dama, valet." *Sovremennye zapiski* (1928), 536–8.
———. "V. Sirin. Vozvrashchenie Chorba." *Sovremennye zapiski* 42 (1930), 530–1.
Tsvetaeva, Marina. "Moi Pushkin." *Sovremennye zapiski* 64 (1937), 196–234.
———. "Poet o kritike." *Blagonamerennyi* 2 (1926), 94–125.
Turintsev, Aleksandr. "Opyt obzora." *Versty* 1 (1926), 213–28.
Tynianov, Iurii. *Arkhaisty i novatory*. 1929. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1967.
———. *Poetika. Istoriia literatury. Kino*. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.
———. *Problema stikhotvornogo iazyka*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1965.
Usievich, Elena. "Maiakovskii i 'levoe' iskusstvo." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 22 (14 April 1936), 4.
"Usilit' bor'bu s formalizmom." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 17 (11 April 1933), 1.
Vaginov, Konstantin. *Polnoe sobranie sochinenii v proze*. Edited by T. Nikol'skaia and V. Erl'. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1999.
Valéry, Paul. *Oeuvres*. 2 vols. Edited by J. Hytier and A. Rouart-Valéry. Paris: Gallimard-Pléiade, 1957.
Vanslov, Viktor, and Mikhail Sokolov, eds. *Modernizm. Analiz i kritika osnovnykh napravlenii*. Moscow: Iskusstvo, 1987.
Varshavskii, Vladimir. "Neskol'ko rassuzhdenii ob Andre Zhide i emigrantskom molodom cheloveke." *Chisla* 4 (1930–31), 216–22.
———. "V. Sirin. 'Podvig.'" *Chisla* 7–8 (1933), 266–7.
Vasilevskii, Il'ia [Ne-Bukva]. "Modernisty." *Satirikon* 25 (20 June 1909), 7–8.
Veidle, Vladimir [N. Dashkov, D. Leis]. *Les Abeilles d'Aristée. Essai sur le destin actuel des lettres et des arts*. 1936. Paris: Gallimard, 1954.
———. "Bolezn' veka." *Zveno* 220 (17 April 1927), 5–6.
———. "Bor'ba s istoriei." *Sovremennye zapiski* 52 (1933), 437–45.
———. "Chelovek protiv pisatelia." *Krug* 2 (1937), 139–45.
———. "I. Bunin. *Lika*." *Russkie zapiski* 18 (1939), 195–6.
———. "Iz evropeiskoi literatury. Bolezn' veka." *Vozrozhdenie* 2004 (27 November 1930), 4.
———. "Literaturnaia anketa." *Chisla* 2–3 (1930), 318–19.
———. "Mir Iskusstva." *Zveno* 1 (1 July 1927), 22–8.

———. "O frantsuzskoi literature." *Sovremennye zapiski* 39 (1929), 491–502.
———. "Pasternak i modernizm." *Literaturnaia ucheba* 1 (1990), 156–63.
———. "Tri Rossii." *Sovremennye zapiski* 65 (1937), 304–22.
———. *Zadacha Rossii*. New York: Izdatel'stvo imeni Chekhova, 1956.
Vekhi. *Sbornik statei o russkoi intelligentsii*. [1909]. Facsimile reprint. Frankfurt: Posev, 1967.
Vengerov, Semën. *Osnovnye cherty istorii noveishei russkoi literatury*. St. Petersburg: Obshchestvennaia pol'za, 1909.
———, ed. *Russkaia literatura XX veka (1890–1910)*. 3 vols. Moscow: Mir, 1914–16.
Vengerova, Zinaida. "Angliiskie futuristy." *Strelets* 1 (1915), 93–104.
———. *Literaturnye kharakteristiki*. Vol. 1. St. Petersburg: A. E. Vinekke, 1897.
———. *Literaturnye kharakteristiki*. Vol. 2. St. Petersburg: A. E. Vinekke, 1905.
———. "Simvolizm v sovremennom ego ponimanii." *Dnevniki pisatelei* 2 (1914), 8–13.
Verbitskaia, Anastasiia. *Kliuchi schast'ia*. Moscow: n.p., 1910.
Verkhovskii, Iurii. "O poetakh i stikhakh. Klassicheskii simvolizm." *Letopis' doma literatorov* 8–9 (25 February 1922), 6–8.
Verlaine, Paul. *Oeuvres poétiques complètes*. Edited by Y.-G. LeDantec and J. Borel. Paris: Gallimard, 1989.
Vermel', Filipp. "Poeziia nashikh dnei." *Chet i nechet. Al'manakh poezii i kritiki*. Moscow: n.p., 1925, 32–4.
Vermel', Samuil. "Pis'ma 'Poslednikh iz mogikan' russkogo futurizma," edited by G. Cheron. In *Ezhegodnik rukopisnogo otdela Pushkinskogo doma na 1994 god*. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1998, 302–15.
"Vesti otovsiudu." *Zolotoe runo* 4 (1907), 80.
Vinaver, Evgenii. "Ugolovnyi roman." *Vstrechi* 6 (1934), 256–9.
Vinogradov, Viktor. *O iazyke khudozhestvennoi prozy*. Moscow: Nauka, 1980.
Vinokur, Grigorii. *Filologicheskie issledovaniia. Lingvistika i poetika*. Moscow: Nauka, 1990.
Visan, Tancrède de. "L'Idéal symboliste." *Le Mercure de France* 242 (16 July 1907), 193–208.
Vishniak, Mark. "Dve svobody." *Sovremennye zapiski* 24 (1925), 321–34.
———. "Opravdanie ravenstva." *Sovremennye zapiski* 22 (1924), 316–35.
Volin, Boris. "Emigrantskaia poeziia." *Na literaturnom postu* 3 (1926), 20–3.
———. "Plody 'Krasnogo dereva.'" *Literaturnaia gazeta* 24 (30 September 1929), 1.
Volkov, Anatolii. "Aleksandr Blok." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 45 (10 August 1936), 2.
———. *Poeziia russkogo imperializma*. Moscow: Khudozhestvennaia literatura, 1935.
———. "Sotsialisticheskii realizm i poeziia burzhuaznogo dekadansa." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 89 (16 July 1934), 2.
Voloshin, Maksimilian. *Maksimilian Voloshin. Iz literaturnogo naslediia*. Edited by V. Bagno and A. Lavrov. 3 vols. St. Petersburg: Nauka, 1991–2003.
Volynskii, Akim. *Bor'ba za idealizm*. St. Petersburg: N. G. Molostvov, 1900.

———. *Russkie kritiki*. St. Petersburg: Tip. Merkusheva, 1896.
Voronskii, Aleksandr. "Iskusstvo, kak poznanie zhizni, i sovremennost'." *Krasnaia nov'* 5 (1923), 347–84.
———. *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1963.
Vorovskii, Vatslav. *Literaturno-kriticheskie stat'i*. Moscow: OGIZ, 1948.
"Vstuplenie." *Apollon* 1 (1909), 3–4.
"V zhurnalakh i gazetakh." *Vesy* 1 (1904), 82.
"V zhurnalakh.—Russkii vestnik." *Vesy* 6 (1904), 70–1.
Wilson, Edmund. *Axel's Castle: A Study in the Imaginative Literature of 1870–1930*. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1931.
Woolf, Virginia. *The Essays of Virginia Woolf*. Vol. 4. Edited by A. McNeille. London: Hogarth Press, 1984.
———. *A Room of One's Own*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1981.
Zabolotskaia, E., ed. *Vospominaniia o N. Zabolotskom*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1984.
Zaitsev, Boris. "Andrei Belyi." *Russkie zapiski* 7 (1938), 78–94.
———. "Pis'ma B. Zaitseva I. i V. Buninym." Edited by M. Green. *Novyi zhurnal* 149 (1982), 127–49.
———. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 5 vols. Edited by T. Prokopov. Moscow: Russkaia kniga, 1999.
Zakat Evropy. Moscow: Bereg, 1922.
Zamiatin, Evgenii. *Litsa*. New York: Mezhdunarodnoe literaturnoe sodruzhestvo, 1967.
———. *My. Roman, povesti, rasskazy, p'esy, stat'i i vospominaniia*. Edited by E. Skorospelova. Kishinev: Literatura artistike, 1989.
Zdanevich, Il'ia [Il'iazd, S. Khudakov]. *Filosofiia futurista*. Edited by R. Gayraud and S. Kudriavtsev. Moscow: Gileia, 2008.
———. "Literatura, khudozhestvennaia kritika, disputy i doklady." In *Oslinyi khvost i Mishen'*. Moscow: Ts. A. Miunster, 1913, 125–51.
———. "Pour défendre Barrès." Edited by R. Gayraud. *Carnets de l'Iliazd Club* 2 (1992), 55–64.
Zelinskii, Kornelii. "K voprosu o formalizme v poezii." *Literaturnaia gazeta* 13 (29 February 1936), 2.
———. "Rubaki na Sene. Poeziia beloi emigratsii." *Za rubezhom* 4 (5 February 1933), 10–11.
Zelinskii, Kornelii, and Il'ia Sel'vinskii, eds. *Biznes. Sbornik literaturnogo tsentra konstruktivistov*. Moscow: Gosudarstvennoe izdatel'stvo, 1929.
———. *Gosplan literatury. Sbornik literaturnogo tsentra konstruktivistov.* Moscow: Krug, 1924.
Zhegalov, N., A. Miasnikov, R. Samarin, and Ia. El'sberg, eds. *Kriticheskii realizm XX veka i modernizm*. Moscow: Nauka, 1967.
Zhirmunskaia, V. "Zhirmunskii i epokha stalinizma." *Russian Literature* 63.2–4 (2008), 367–96.

Zhirmunskii, Viktor. *Drama Aleksandra Bloka "Roza i krest." Literaturnye istochniki*. 1946. Leningrad: LGU, 1964.
———. *Nemetskii romantizm i sovremennaia mistika*. St. Petersburg: n.p., 1914.
———. *Poetika russkoi poezii*. St. Petersburg: Azbuka-klassika, 2001.
———. "Po povodu knigi 'Ritm kak dialektika.'" *Zvezda* 8 (1929), 203–8.
———. *Sravnitel'noe literaturovedenie. Vostok i Zapad*. Leningrad: Nauka, 1979.
———. *Teoriia literatury. Poetika. Stilistika*. Edited by Iu. Levin, D. Likhachev, and N. Zhirmunskaia. Leningrad: Nauka, 1977.
———. *Valerii Briusov i nasledie Pushkina*. Petrograd: El'zevir, 1922.
———. *Voprosy teorii literatury*. Leningrad: Akademiia, 1928.
Zhukov, P. "Protiv klichek." *Zvezda* 5 (1924), 255–63.
Zinov'eva-Annibal, Lidiia. "Obozrenie russkikh zhurnalov.—F. Sologub. 'Melkii bes.'" *Vesy* 9–10 (1905), 81–5.
———. *Tridtsat' tri uroda*. Edited by M. Mikhailova. Moscow: Agraf, 1999.
Zlobin, Vladimir. "Versty." *Novyi dom* 1 (1926), 35–7.
Zoshchenko, Mikhail. *Sobranie sochinenii*. 7 vols. Edited by I. Sukhikh. Moscow: Vremia, 2008.

Secondary Sources

Abrams, M. H. *The Mirror and the Lamp*. New York: Oxford UP, 1953.
———. *Natural Supernaturalism*. New York: W. W. Norton, 1971.
Abrams, Philip. "Rites de Passage: The Conflict of Generations in Industrial Society." *Journal of Contemporary History* 5.175 (1970), 175–90.
Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities*. London: Verso, 2006.
Anderson, Perry. *A Zone of Engagement*. London: Verso, 1992.
Anemone, Anthony, ed. *Just Assassins: The Culture of Terrorism in Russia*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2010.
Armstrong, Tim. *Modernism: A Cultural History*. Cambridge: Polity, 2005.
Ardis, Ann. *Modernism and Cultural Conflict, 1880–1922*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2002.
Aron, Raymond. *L'Opium des intellectuels*. Paris: Hachette, 2002.
Auerbach, Erich. *Mimesis*. Translated by W. Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953.
Azadovskii, Konstantin, and Dmitrii Maksimov. "Briusov i 'Vesy.'" In *Valerii Briusov*. *Literaturnoe nasledstvo* 85. Moscow: Nauka, 1976, 257–324.
Bagno, Vsevolod, John Malmstad, and Mariia Malikova, eds. *Na rubezhe dvukh stoletii*. Moscow: NLO, 2009.
Baïdine, Valerii. *L'Archaïsme dans l'avant-garde russe*. Lyon: Université Jean Moulin, 2006.
Balakian, Anna, ed. *The Symbolist Movement in the Literature of European Languages*. Budapest: Akademiai Kiado, 1982.

Balashov, N. "Iubileinoe izdanie k chetyrekhsotletiiu 'Don Kikhota Lamanchskogo.'" In *Khitroumnyi idal'go Don Kikhot Lamanchskii*, by Miguel de Cervantes Saavedra. Vol. 1. Moscow: Nauka, 2003, 5–14.

Banerjee, Anindita. *We Modern People: Science Fiction and the Making of Russian Modernity*. Middletown: Wesleyan UP, 2012.

Baran, Henryk. *Poetika russkoi literatury nachala XX veka*. Moscow: Progress-Univers, 1993.

Barthes, Roland. *Mythologies*. Paris: Seuil, 1970.

Bauman, Zygmunt. *Modernity and Ambivalence*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Bayle, Jean-Louis Loubet del. *Les Non-conformistes des années trente*. Paris: Seuil, 2001.

Beer, Daniel. *Renovating Russia: The Human Sciences and the Fate of Liberal Modernity*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2008.

Belaia, Galina. *Zakonomernosti stilevogo razvitiia sovetskoi prozy dvadtsatykh godov*. Moscow: Nauka, 1977.

Beliakova, I., ed. *"V rasseianii sushchie. . . ."* Moscow: Dom-muzei Mariny Tsvetaevoi, 2006.

Belous, Vladimir. *Vol'fila*. 2 vols. Moscow: Modest Kolerov, 2005.

Berg, Christian, Frank Durieux, and Geert Lernout, eds. *The Turn of the Century*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 1995.

Berghaus, Günter. *Theatre, Performance, and the Historical Avant-Garde*. New York: Palgrave, 2005.

Berman, Art. *Preface to Modernism*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1994.

Berman, Marshall. *All That Is Solid Melts into Air: The Experience of Modernity*. London: Verso, 2010.

Bernheimer, Charles. *Decadent Subjects*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2002.

Bernstein, Laurie. *Sonia's Daughters: Prostitutes and Their Regulation in Imperial Russia*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1995.

Beyer, Thomas, ed. *Russische Autoren und Verlage in Berlin nach dem Ersten Weltkrieg*. Berlin: Arno Spitz, 1987, 59–141.

Bialik, Boris, ed. *Literaturno-esteticheskie kontseptsii v Rossii kontsa XIX–nachala XX v*. Moscow: Nauka, 1975.

Bialik, Boris, Vsevolod Keldysh, and Vladimir Shcherbina. *Literaturnyi protsess i russkaia zhurnalistika kontsa XIX–nachala XX veka*. Moscow: Nauka, 1982.

Bialik, Boris, Evgenii Tager, and Vladimir Shcherbina, eds. *Russkaia literatura kontsa XIX–nachala XX v.* Vol. 1: *Devianostye gody*. Vol. 2: *1901–1907*. Moscow: Nauka, 1968–71.

Blium, Arlen. *Sovetskaia tsenzura v epokhu total'nogo terrora*. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000.

———. *Za kulisami "ministerstva pravdy."* St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1994.

Bliumbaum, Arkadii. "Loci Communes evreiskogo voprosa v tvorchestve Bloka." *Die Welt der Slaven* 59 (2014), 242–67.

Bogomolov, Nikolai. "K izucheniiu poezii vtoroi poloviny 1910-kh godov." *Tynianovskii sbornik* 3. Riga: Zinatne, 1988, 174-83.

———. "Proekt 'Akmeizm.'" *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 58 (2002), 140-80.

———. *Russkaia literatura pervoi treti XX veka*. Tomsk: Vodolei, 1999.

Bogomolov, Nikolai, Aleksandr Kobrinskii, and Oleg Lekmanov, eds. *Ot simvolistov do oberiutov. Poeziia russkogo modernizma. Antologiia*. 2 vols. Moscow: Ellis Lak, 2000-1.

Boichuk, A., ed. *Andrei Belyi. Publikatsii. Issledovaniia*. Moscow: IMLI-RAN, 2002.

Boldt, Frank, Dmitrii Segal, and Lazar´ Fleishman. "Problemy izucheniia literatury russkoi emigratsii pervoi treti XX veka." *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 3 (1978), 75-88.

Borenstein, Eliot. *Men without Women: Masculinity and Revolution in Russian Fiction*. Durham: Duke UP, 2000.

Bourdieu, Pierre. *The Field of Cultural Production*. Edited by R. Johnson. New York: Columbia UP, 1993.

Bowra, C. M. *The Romantic Imagination*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1949.

Boym, Svetlana. *Common Places: Mythologies of Everyday Life in Russia*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1994.

Bradbury, Malcolm, and James McFarlane, eds. *Modernism, 1890-1930*. New York: Penguin, 1976.

Brandenberger, David. *Propaganda State in Crisis: Soviet Ideology, Indoctrination, and Terror under Stalin*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2011.

Brandist, Craig. *Carnival Culture and the Soviet Modernist Novel*. London: Macmillan Press, 1996.

Bristow, Edward. *Prostitution and Prejudice*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1982.

Bronner, Stephen. *Modernism at the Barricades*. New York: Columbia UP, 2012.

Brooker, Peter, Sascha Bru, Andrew Thacker, and Christian Weikop, eds. *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines*. Vol. 3.2: *Europe 1880-1940*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.

Brooker, Peter, Andrzej Gasiorek, Deborah Longworth, and Andrew Thacker, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Modernisms*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2010.

Brooker, Peter, and Andrew Thacker, eds. *The Oxford Critical and Cultural History of Modernist Magazines*. Vol. 1: *Britain and Ireland 1880-1955*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2009.

Brooks, Jeffrey. *When Russia Learned to Read*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985.

Brooks, Peter. *Realist Vision*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2005.

Brown, Edward. "The Symbolist Contamination of Gor'kii's 'Realistic' Style." *Slavic Review* 47.2 (1988), 227-38.

Brown, Kevin. *The Pox: The Life and Near Death of a Very Social Disease*. Phoenix Mill: Sutton, 2006.

Buchloh, Benjamin, Serge Guilbaut, and David Solkin, eds. *Modernism and Modernity*. Halifax: NSCAD, 2004.

Budnitskii, Oleg. *Terrorizm v rossiiskom osvoboditel'nom dvizhenii*. Moscow: Rosspen, 2000.

Burbank, Jane. *Intelligentsia and Revolution*. New York: Oxford UP, 1986.

Bürger, Peter. *Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Translated by Michael Shaw. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1984.

Byford, Andy. *Literary Scholarship in Late Imperial Russia*. London: Legenda, 2007.

Bystrov, Viacheslav, Natal'ia Griakalova, and Aleksandr Lavrov, eds. *Pisateli simvolistskogo kruga*. St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 2003.

Calder, Jenni. *Robert Louis Stevenson*. New York: Oxford UP, 1980.

Calinescu, Matei. *Five Faces of Modernity*. Durham: Duke UP, 1987.

Cantor, Norman. *Twentieth-Century Culture: Modernism to Deconstruction*. New York: Peter Lang, 1988.

Carey, John. *The Intellectual and the Masses*. London: Faber & Faber, 1992.

Carleton, Gregory. *The Politics of Reception: Critical Constructions of Mikhail Zoshchenko*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1998.

Carlson, Maria. *"No Religion Higher Than Truth": A History of the Theosophical Movement in Russia*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1993.

Carlston, Erin. *Thinking Fascism: Sapphic Modernism and Fascist Modernity*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1998.

Cassedy, Steven. *Flight from Eden: The Origins of Modern Literary Criticism and Theory*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.

Castle, Gregory, ed. *A History of the Modernist Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2015.

Cavanagh, Clare. *Osip Mandelstam and the Modernist Creation of Tradition*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1995.

Chamberlin, Edward, and Sander Gilman. *Degeneration*. New York: Columbia UP, 1985.

Chapoutot, Johann. *La Loi du sang. Penser et agir en nazi*. Paris: Gallimard, 2014.

Charle, Christophe. *Les Intellectuels en Europe au XIXe siècle*. Paris: Seuil, 1996.

Chefdor, Monique, Ricardo Quinones, and Albert Wachtel, eds. *Modernism*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1986.

Chénieux-Gendron, Jacqueline, Tamara Balashova, and Elena Gal'tsova, eds. *Prevratnosti vybora. Antologii i slovari v praktike siurrealizma*. Moscow: IMLI, 2004.

Chudakova, Marietta. *Literatura sovetskogo proshlogo*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2001.

Chudakova, Marietta, Evgenii Toddes, and Iurii Tsiv'ian, eds. *Sed'mye tynianovskie chteniia*. *Tynianovskie sborniki* 9. Riga: n.p., 1995–96.

———, eds. *Shestye-Sed'mye-Vos'mye Tynianovskie chteniia*. *Tynianovskii sbornik* 10. Moscow: n.p, 1998.

Childs, Peter. *Modernism*. London: Routledge, 2008.

Clark, Katerina. *Moscow, the Fourth Rome: Stalinism, Cosmopolitanism, and the Evolution of Soviet Culture, 1931–1941*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2011.

———. *Petersburg: Crucible of Cultural Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1995.
Clark, Katerina, and Evgenii Dobrenko, eds. *Soviet Culture and Power: A History in Documents*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2007.
Clark, Suzanne. *Sentimental Modernism: Women Writers and the Revolution of the Word*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.
Clowes, Edith. *The Revolution of Moral Consciousness: Nietzsche in Russian Literature*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 1988.
Clowes, Edith, Samuel Kassow, and James West, eds. *Between Tsar and People*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
Cohen, Aaron. *Imagining the Unimaginable: World War, Modern Art, and the Politics of Public Culture in Russia*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 2008.
Compagnon, Antoine. *Les Cinq paradoxes de la modernité*. Paris: Seuil, 1990.
Confino, Michael. "On Intellectuals and Intellectual Traditions in Eighteenth- and Nineteenth-Century Russia." *Daedalus* 101.2 (1972), 117–49.
Conroy, Mary. *In Health and in Sickness: Pharmacy, Pharmacists, and the Pharmaceutical Industry in Late Imperial, Early Soviet Russia*. Boulder: East European Monographs, 1994.
Constable, Liz, Dennis Denisoff, and Matthew Potolsky, eds. *Perennial Decay: On the Aesthetics and Politics of Decadence*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 1999.
Cooper, John Xiros. *Modernism and the Culture of Market Society*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2004.
Corbett, David, and Andew Thacker. "Raymond Williams and Cultural Formations: Movements and Magazines." *Prose Studies* 16.2 (1993), 84–106.
Corbin, Alain. *Les Filles de noce*. Paris: Aubier Montaigne, 1978.
Cottington, David. *The Avant-Garde*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2013.
Coyle, Michael. *Ezra Pound, Popular Genres, and the Discourse of Culture*. University Park: Penn State UP, 1995.
Crone, Anna Lisa. *Rozanov and the End of Literature*. Würzburg: Jal-Verlag, 1978.
Crook, Stephen. *Modernist Radicalism and Its Aftermath*. London: Routledge, 1991.
Daly, Nicholas. *Modernism, Romance and the Fin de Siècle*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1999.
David-Fox, Michael. *Crossing Borders: Modernity, Ideology, and Culture in Russia and the Soviet Union*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2015.
Davidson, Roger, and Lesley Hall, eds. *Sex, Sin and Suffering: Venereal Disease and European Society since 1870*. London: Routledge, 2001.
Davis, Thomas. *The Extinct Scene: Late Modernism and Everyday Life*. New York: Columbia UP, 2016.
Davydova, Tat'iana. *Russkii neorealizm*. Moscow: Flinta-Nauka, 2005.
Delany, Paul. *Literature, Money and the Market*. New York: Palgrave, 2002.
Depretto, Catherine. *Le Formalisme en Russie*. Paris: Institut d'études slaves, 2009.

Dettmar, Kevin, and Stephen Watt, eds. *Marketing Modernisms*. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1996.

DiBattista, Maria, and Lucy McDiarmid, eds. *High and Low Moderns*. New York: Oxford UP, 1996.

Dijkstra, Bram. *Idols of Perversity: Fantasies of Feminine Evil in Fin-de-Siècle Culture*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1986.

Dinershtein, Efim. *Ivan Dmitrievich Sytin i ego delo*. Moscow: Moskovskie uchebniki, 2003.

Dobrenko, Evgenii. *Aesthetics of Alienation: Reassessment of Early Soviet Cultural Theories*. Translated by Jesse Savage. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 2005.

———. *Formovka sovetskogo pisatelia.* St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1999.

Dobrenko, Evgenii, and Marina Balina, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to Twentieth-Century Russian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.

Dobrenko, Evgenii, and Galin Tihanov, eds. *A History of Russian Literary Theory and Criticism*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2011.

Dolgopolov, Leonid. *Andrei Belyi i ego roman "Peterburg."* Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1988.

———. *Na rubezhe vekov.* Leningrad: Sovetskii pisatel', 1977.

Dolinin, Alexander. "Propushchennye zven'ia v istorii termina 'serebrianyi vek.' 1946–1952." Conference paper, University of Tartu, 21 June 2017.

Donchin, Georgette. *The Influence of French Symbolism on Russian Poetry*. The Hague: Mouton, 1958.

Edson, Evelyn. *The World Map, 1300–1492*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2007.

Egbert, Donald. *Social Radicalism and the Arts*. New York: Alfred Knopf, 1970.

Eilberg-Schwartz, Howard. *People of the Body: Jews and Judaism from an Embodied Perspective*. Albany: SUNY P, 1992.

Ekonen, Kirsti. *Tvorets, sub''ekt, zhenshchina*. Moscow: NLO, 2011.

Eliade, Mircea. *Aspects du mythe*. Paris: Gallimard, 1997.

Emerson, Caryl. *The Cambridge Introduction to Russian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2008.

Engelstein, Laura, and Stephanie Sandler, eds. *Self and Story in Russian History*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2000.

Erlich, Victor. *Modernism and Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1994.

Esaulov, Ivan, ed. *Postsimvolizm kak iavlenie kul'tury*. 4 vols. Moscow: RGGU, 1995–2003.

Eshelman, Raoul. *Early Soviet Postmodernism*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1997.

———. *Nikolaj Gumilev and Neoclassical Modernism*. Frankfurt: Peter Lang, 1993.

Esty, Jed. *A Shrinking Island: Modernism and National Culture in England*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2003.

Etkind, Aleksandr. *Sodom i Psikheia*. Moscow: ITS, 1996.

Etkind, Efim, Georges Nivat, Ilya Serman, and Vittorio Strada, eds. *Histoire de la littérature russe. Le XXe siècle*. Vol. 1: *L'Age d'argent*; Vol. 2: *La Révolution et les années vingt*. Paris: Fayard, 1987–88.

———, eds. *La Letteratura Russa del Novecento*. Napoli: Instituto Suor Orsola Benincasa, 1990.

Evgen'ev-Maksimov, Vladislav, and Dmitrii Maksimov. *Iz proshlogo russkoi zhurnalistiki*. Leningrad: Izdatel'stvo pisatelei v Leningrade, 1930.

Eysteinsson, Astradur. *The Concept of Modernism*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1990.

Eysteinsson, Astradur, and Vivian Liska, eds. *Modernism*. 2 vols. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2007.

Ferrall, Charles. *Modernist Writing and Reactionary Politics*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2001.

Figes, Orlando. *A People's Tragedy: The Russian Revolution, 1891–1924*. New York: Penguin, 1998.

———. *The Whisperers: Private Life in Stalin's Russia*. New York: Metropolitan Books, 2007.

Figes, Orlando, and Boris Kolonitskii. *Interpreting the Russian Revolution*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1999.

Fink, Hilary. *Bergson and Russian Modernism*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1999.

Finkel, Stuart. "Purging the Public Intellectual: The 1922 Expulsions from Soviet Russia." *Russian Review* 62 (2003), 589–613.

Fish, Stanley. *Is There a Text in This Class?* Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila. *The Commissariat of Enlightenment*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1970.

———. *The Cultural Front: Power and Culture in Revolutionary Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1992.

———, ed. *Cultural Revolution in Russia, 1928–1931*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1978.

———. *Everyday Stalinism*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.

———. *Tear Off the Masks! Identity and Imposture in Twentieth-Century Russia*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 2005.

Fitzpatrick, Sheila, Alexander Rabinowitch, and Richard Stites, eds. *Russia in the Era of NEP*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

Fleishman, Lazar'. *Boris Pasternak i literaturnoe dvizhenie 1930-kh godov*. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2005.

———. *Boris Pasternak v dvadtsatye gody*. Munich: Wilhelm Fink Verlag, 1980.

———. "Iz arkhiva Guverovskogo instituta. Pis'ma Iu. G. Oksmana k G. P. Struve." *Stanford Slavic Studies* 1 (1987), 15–70.

Fokkema, Douwe. *Literary History, Modernism, and Postmodernism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1984.

Fontenot, Michael. "Symbolism in Persuasion: The Influence of the Merezhkovskii

Circle on the Rhetoric of Aleksandr Fedorovich Kerenskii." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 26.1–3 (1992), 241–65.

Forth, Christopher. *The Dreyfus Affair and the Crisis of French Manhood*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins UP, 2004.

Foster, John. *Heirs to Dionysus: A Nietzschean Current in Literary Modernism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1981.

Freedman, Jonathan. *The Temple of Culture: Assimilation and Anti-Semitism in Literary Anglo-America*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2000.

Freidin, Gregory. *A Coat of Many Colors: Osip Mandelstam and His Mythologies of Self-Presentation*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1987.

Friedman, Susan. "Definitional Excursions: The Meanings of Modern/Modernity/Modernism." *Modernism/Modernity* 8.3 (2001), 493–513.

———. "Periodizing Modernism: Postcolonial Modernities and the Space/Time Borders of Modernist Studies." *Modernism/Modernity* 13.3 (2006), 425–43.

Frolova, Irina, ed. *Kniga v Rossii, 1895–1917*. St. Petersburg: Rossiiskaia natsional'naia biblioteka, 2008.

Frye, Northrop, ed. *Romanticism Reconsidered*. New York: Columbia UP, 1964.

Furst, Lilian. *Romanticism*. London: Methuen, 1969.

Fusso, Susanne, and Priscilla Meyer, eds. *Essays on Gogol*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1992.

Garb, Tamar. *Bodies of Modernity: Figure and Flesh in Fin-de-Siècle France*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1998.

Garvin, Harry, ed. *Romanticism, Modernism, Postmodernism*. Lewisburg: Bucknell UP, 1980.

Gasparov, Boris, Robert Hughes, and Irina Paperno, eds. *Cultural Mythologies of Russian Modernism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1992.

Gasparov, Mikhail, and Inna Koretskaia, eds. *Russkaia poeziia "serebrianogo veka," 1890–1917. Antologiia*. Moscow: Nauka, 1993.

Gassner, Chubertus, ed. *Agitatsiia za schast'e: sovetskoe iskusstvo stalinskoi epokhi*. Düsseldorf-Bremen: Temmen, 1994.

Gay, Peter. *Freud, Jews and Other Germans: Masters and Victims in Modernist Culture*. New York: Oxford UP, 1978.

———. *Modernism*. London: William Heinemann, 2007.

Gayraud, Régis. "Iliazd. L'Avant-garde russe racontée aux dadas." *Pleine marge* 33 (2001), 97–120.

Geertz, Clifford. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books 1973.

Geller, Leonid. "Smutnyi mif, zabytyi faktor v kul'ture XX veka. Anarkhiia." *Tynianovskii sbornik* 12. Moscow: Vodolei, 2006, 437–51.

Genieva, Ekaterina, ed. *"Russkaia odisseia" Dzheimsa Dzhoisa*. Moscow: Rudomino, 2005.

Genter, Robert. *Late Modernism: Art, Culture, and Politics in Cold War America*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2010.

Gentile, Emilio. *The Struggle for Modernity*. Westport: Praeger, 2003.

Gibian, George, and William Tjalsma, eds. *Russian Modernism: Culture and the Avant-Garde, 1900–1930*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1976.

Gijswijt-Hofstra, Marijke, and Roy Porter, eds. *Cultures of Neurasthenia*. Amsterdam: Rodopi, 2001.

Gilbert, Sandra, and Susan Gubar, eds. *The Female Imagination and the Modernist Aesthetic*. New York: Gordon and Breach, 1986.

Gilman, Sander. *Difference and Pathology*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1985.

———. *The Jew's Body*. New York: Routledge, 1991.

Gindin, Sergei. "Pervyi konflikt dvukh pokolenii osnovatelei russkogo stikhovedeniia." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 86 (2004), 64–78.

Gindin, Sergei, Nikolai Grintser, and Elena Shumilova, eds. *Materialy mezhdunarodnogo kongressa "100 let R. O. Iakobsonu."* Moscow: RGGU, 1996.

Girin, Iurii, ed. *Avangard v kul'ture XX veka*. 2 vols. Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2010.

Glavatskii, Mikhail. *"Filosofskii parokhod." God 1922*. Ekaterinburg: Izdatel'stvo Ural'skogo universiteta, 2002.

Gluck, Mary. *Popular Bohemia: Modernism and Urban Culture in Nineteenth-Century Paris*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 2005.

Golomshtok, Igor'. *Totalitarnoe iskusstvo*. Moscow: Galant, 1994.

Gombrich, R. H. *Norm and Form: Studies in the Art of the Renaissance*. London: Phaidon Press, 1966.

Gorham, Michael. *Speaking in Soviet Tongues*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2003.

Goriainov, A. "Vozdeistvie russkoi emigratsii na SSSR v 1930-e–1950-e gg." *Nansenovskie chteniia 2008*. St. Petersburg: Institut istorii RAN, 2009, 427–42.

Gorsuch, Anne. *Youth in Revolutionary Russia*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2000.

Goscilo, Helena, and Beth Holmgren, eds. *Russia. Women. Culture*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1996.

Gouldner, Alvin. *The Future of Intellectuals and the Rise of the New Class*. New York: Seabury Press, 1979.

Graña, César. *Bohemian versus Bourgeois: French Society and the French Man of Letters in the Nineteenth Century*. New York: Basic Books, 1964.

Griffin, Roger. *Modernism and Fascism*. New York: Palgrave, 2007.

Grigor'eva, Nadezhda. *Anima Laborans. Pisatel' i trud v Rossii 1920-30-kh godov*. St. Petersburg: Aleteia, 2005.

Groys, Boris. "Nitssheanskie temy i motivy v sovetskoi kul'ture 30-kh godov." *Bakhtinskii sbornik* 2 (1992), 104–26.

———. *The Total Art of Stalinism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1992.

———. "Totalitarizm karnavala." *Bakhtinskii sbornik* 3 (1997), 76–80.

Guerra, René. *"Kogda my v Rossiiu vernemsia. . . ."* St. Petersburg: Rostok, 2010.

Günther, Hans, and Evgenii Dobrenko, eds. *Sotsrealisticheskii kanon*. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2000.

Gurianova, Nina. *The Aesthetics of Anarchy: Art and Ideology in the Early Russian Avant-Garde*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2012.

Gutkin, Irina. *The Cultural Origins of the Socialist Realist Aesthetic*. Evanston: Northwestern UP, 1999.

Halfin, Igal. "The Rape of the Intelligentsia: A Proletarian Foundational Myth." *Russian Review* 56.1 (1997), 90–109.

Hansen-Löve, Aage. *Russkii formalizm*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2001.

Harrington, Alexandra. "Anna Akhmatova's Biographical Myth-Making." *Slavic and East European Review* 89.3 (2011), 456–93.

Harrowitz, Nancy, and Barbara Hyams, eds. *Jews and Gender*. Philadelphia: Temple UP, 1995.

Hayden, Deborah. *Pox: Genius, Madness, and the Mysteries of Syphilis*. New York: Basic Books, 2003.

Hellman, Ben. *Poets of Hope and Despair: The Russian Symbolists in War and Revolution*. Helsinki: Institute of Russian and East European Studies, 1995.

Herf, Jeffrey. *Reactionary Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Hipsky, Martin. *Modernism and the Women's Popular Romance in Britain*. Athens: Ohio UP, 2011.

Hobsbawm, Eric. *The Age of Revolution: Europe, 1789–1848*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicolson, 1962.

Hoesterey, Ingeborg, ed. *Zeitgeist in Babel: The Postmodernist Controversy*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 1991.

Hoffmann, David, and Yanni Kotsonis, eds. *Russian Modernity*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 2000.

Howe, Irving. *Decline of the New*. New York: Harcourt, Brace & World, 1970.

———, ed. *The Idea of the Modern in Literature and the Arts*. New York: Horizon Press, 1967.

Huszar, George Bernard, ed. *The Intellectuals: A Controversial Portrait*. Glencoe: Free Press, 1960.

Hutchinson, Ben. *Modernism and Style*. New York: Palgrave, 2011.

Huyssen, Andreas. *After the Great Divide: Modernism, Mass Culture and Postmodernism*. London: Macmillan, 1988.

Huyssen, Andreas, and David Bathrick, eds. *Modernity and the Text: Revisions of German Modernism*. New York: Columbia UP, 1989.

Hynes, Samuel. *The Auden Generation: Literature and Politics in England in the 1930s*. London: Bodley Head, 1976.

Ioffe, Dennis, and Frederick White. *The Russian Avant-Garde and Radical Modernism*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2012.

Ivanitskaia, Elena. "Spor o Serebrianom veke." *Oktiabr'* 10 (1994), 181–7.

Ivanov, Viacheslav Vs. *Izbrannye trudy po semiotike i istorii kul'tury*. 2 vols. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2000.

———. "*The Total Art of Stalinism*, by Boris Groys." *Slavic Review* 52.3 (1993), 600–4.

Ivanov, Vladislav, ed. *Mnemozina. Dokumenty i fakty iz istorii otechestvennogo teatra XX veka*. Vol. 4. Moscow: Indrik, 2009.

Ivanova, Evgeniia, ed. *Chukovskii i Zhabotinskii*. Moscow: Gesharim-Mosty kul'tury, 2005.

Jaccard, Jean-Philippe, and Annick Morard, eds. *1913. Slovo kak takovoe*. St. Petersburg: Evropeiskii universitet, 2015.

Jackson, Robert, and Stephen Rudy, eds. *Russian Formalism*. New Haven: Yale Center for International and Area Studies, 1985.

Jangfeldt, Bengt, ed. *Iakobson-budetlianin*. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1992.

———. *Stavka—zhizn'. Vladimir Maiakovskii i ego krug*. Moscow: Kolibri, 2009.

Jauss, Hans Robert. *Toward an Aesthetic of Reception*. Translated by T. Bahti. Minneapolis: U of Minnesota P, 1982.

Jensen, Robert. *Marketing Modernism in Fin-de-Siècle Europe*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1994.

Jones, Malcolm, and Robin Feuer Miller, eds. *The Cambridge Companion to the Classic Russian Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Josipovici, Gabriel. *What Ever Happened to Modernism?* New Haven: Yale UP, 2010.

———. *The World and the Book*. London: Macmillan, 1994.

Joyeux-Prunel, Béatrice. *Les Avant-gardes artistiques*. Paris: Gallimard, 2015.

Karabchievskii, Iurii. *Voskresenie Maiakovskogo*. Moscow: Russkie slovari, 2000.

Kassow, Samuel. *Students, Professors, and the State in Tsarist Russia*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.

Katanian, Vasilii. *Maiakovskii. Khronika zhizni i deiatel'nosti*. Edited by A. Parnis. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1985.

Katsis, Leonid. *Vladimir Maiakovskii. Poet v intellektual'nom kontekste epokhi*. Moscow: Iazyki russkoi kul'tury, 2000.

Kazanskaia, L. "Artur Lur'e i ego pervaia muzykal'no-kriticheskaia stat'ia." In *Ezhegodnik ruskopisnogo otdela Pushkinskogo doma na 1995 god*. St. Petersburg: Dmitrii Bulanin, 1999, 52–69.

Keldysh, Vsevolod, ed. *Sviaz' vremen. Problemy preemstvennosti v russkoi literature kontsa XIX–nachala XX v*. Moscow: Nasledie, 1992.

Keldysh, Vsevolod, Vladimir Barakhov, and Stanislav Zaika, eds. *Neizvestnyi Gor'kii*. Moscow: Nasledie, 1994.

Keldysh, Vsevolod, and Nikolai Bogomolov, eds. *Russkaia literatura rubezha vekov*. 2 vols. Moscow: IMLI RAN–Nasledie, 2000–1.

Kellogg, Michael. *The Russian Roots of Nazism: White Émigrés and the Making of National Socialism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2005.

Kelly, Catriona, ed. *Utopias: Russian Modernist Texts, 1905-1940*. London: Penguin, 1999.

Kelly, Catriona, and David Shepherd, eds. *Constructing Russian Culture in the Age of Revolution*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1998.

Kermode, Frank. *History and Value*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1988.

Kern, Stephen. *The Modernist Novel*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.

Keys, Roger. *The Reluctant Modernist: Andrei Belyi and the Development of Russian Fiction*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1996.

Khrenov, Nikolai, ed. *Pokolenie v sotsial'no-kul'turnom kontekste XX veka*. Moscow: Nauka, 2005.

Kiaer, Christina, and Eric Naiman, eds. *Everyday Life in Early Soviet Russia*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2006.

Kling, Oleg. "Evoliutsiia i 'latentnoe' sushchestvovanie simvolizma posle oktiabria." *Voprosy literatury* 4 (1999), 37-64.

Korostelev, Oleg, and Manfred Schruba, eds. *"Sovremennye zapiski." Iz arkhiva redaktsii*. 4 vols. Moscow: NLO, 2011-13.

Kozhinov, Vadim, ed. *Smena literaturnykh stilei*. Moscow: Nauka, 1974.

Krauss, Rosalind. *The Originality of the Avant-Garde and Other Modernist Myths*. Cambridge, MA: MIT P, 1986.

Krusanov, Andrei. *Futuristicheskaia revoliutsiia: 1917-1921*. 2 vols. Moscow: NLO, 2003.

———. *Russkii avangard: 1907-1932*. 3 vols. St. Petersburg: NLO, 1996.

Krutikova, Nina. *V nachale veka. Gor'kii i simvolisty*. Kiev: Naukova dumka, 1978.

Kujundzic, Dragan. *The Returns of History: Russian Nietzscheans after Modernity*. Albany: SUNY P, 1997.

Kunichika, Michael. *"Our Native Antiquity": Archeology and Aesthetics in the Culture of Russian Modernism*. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2015.

Lahire, Bernard. *Franz Kafka*. Paris: Éditions La Découverte, 2010.

Lahusen, Thomas, and Evgenii Dobrenko, eds. *Socialist Realism without Shores*. Durham: Duke UP, 1997.

Lanne, Jean-Claude, ed. *L'Âge d'argent dans la culture russe*. Lyon: Université Jean Moulin, 2007.

———. *La Fin des Modernités*. Lyon: Université Jean Moulin, 2005.

Laqueur, Walter. *Russia and Germany: A Century of Conflict*. Boston: Little, Brown, 1965.

Lasowski, Patrick. *Syphilis. Essai sur la littérature française du XIXe siècle*. Paris: Gallimard, 1982.

Latour, Bruno. *We Have Never Been Modern*. Translated by C. Porter. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1993.

Lavrov, Aleksandr. *Andrei Belyi*. Moscow: NLO, 2007.

———. *Russkie simvolisty*. Moscow: Progress-Pleiada, 2007.
———. "'Serebianyi vek' i/ili 'panteon sovremennoi poshlosti.'" *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 51 (2001), 240–7.
Lavrov, Aleksandr, and Sergei Grechishkin, eds. *Simvolisty vblizi*. St. Petersburg: Skifiia, 2004.
Lekmanov, Oleg. *Kniga ob akmeizme i drugie raboty*. Tomsk: Vodolei, 2000.
———. "Kontseptsiia 'Serebrianogo veka' i akmeizma v zapisnykh knizhkakh A. Akhmatovoi." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 46 (2000), 216–30.
———. *Zhizn' Osipa Mandel'shtama*. St. Petersburg: Zvezda, 2003.
Lekmanov, Oleg, and Vadim Polonskii, eds. *Russkaia literatura kontsa XIX–nachala XX veka v zerkale sovremennoi nauki*. Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2008.
Léonard, Albert. *La Crise du concept de littérature en France au XXe siècle*. Paris: José Corti, 1974.
Lesnevskii, Stanislav, and Aleksandr Mikhailov, eds. *Andrei Belyi. Problemy tvorchestva*. Moscow: Sovetskii pisatel', 1988.
Levenson, Michael. *A Genealogy of Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1984.
———. *Modernism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2011.
Levin, Iurii, Dmitrii Segal, Roman Timenchik, Vladimir Toporov, and Tat'iana Tsiv'ian. "Russkaia semanticheskaia poetika kak potentsial'naia kul'turnaia paradigma." *Russian Literature* 3.2–3 (1974), 47–82.
Leving, Iurii, and Evgenii Soshkin, eds. *Imperiia N. Nabokov i nasledniki*. Moscow: NLO, 2006.
Levinton, Georgii. "Jakobsoniana 1–2." In *Tynianovskii sbornik* 13. Moscow: Vodolei, 2008, 566–7.
Levitina, Viktoriia. *Russkii teatr i evrei*. 2 vols. Jerusalem: Biblioteka Aliia, 1988.
Lewis, Pericles, ed. *The Cambridge Companion to European Modernism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.
Lipovetskii, Mark. *Paralogii. Transformatsii (post)modernistskogo diskursa v russkoi kul'ture 1920–2000-kh godov*. Moscow: NLO, 2008.
———. *Russian Postmodernist Fiction*. New York: M. E. Sharpe, 1999.
Livak, Leonid. "L'Émigration russe et les élites culturelles françaises, 1920–1925. Les Débuts d'une collaboration." *Cahiers du monde russe* 48.1 (2007), 23–43.
———. *How It Was Done in Paris: Russian Émigré Literature and French Modernism*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2003.
———. *The Jewish Persona in the European Imagination: A Case of Russian Literature*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2010.
———. "Nina Berberova et la mythologie culturelle de l'émigration russe en France." *Cahiers du monde russe* 43.2–3 (2002), 463–78.
———. "Rannii period russkoi emigratsii. Po materialam sobraniia Sofii i Ezhena Peti." In *A Century's Perspective*, edited by L. Fleishman and H. McLean. Stanford: Stanford Slavic Studies, 2006, 416–51.

———. *Russian Émigrés in the Intellectual and Literary Life of Interwar France: A Bibliographical Essay*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2010.

Livak, Leonid, and Andrei Ustinov. *Literaturnyi avangard russkogo Parizha (1920–1926)*. Moscow: OGI, 2014.

Loewen, Donald. *The Most Dangerous Art: Poetry, Politics, and Autobiography after the Russian Revolution*. Lanham: Lexington Books, 2008.

———. "Twentieth-Century Russian Literature and the North American Pedagogical Canon." *Slavic and East European Journal* 50.1 (2006), 172–86.

Losev, Aleksei, "Modernistskaia model'" [c. 1970]. *Vestnik Moskovskogo universiteta* 9.1 (1996), 136–49.

Lotman, Iurii. *Iu. M. Lotman i tartussko-moskovskaia semioticheskaia shkola*. Edited by A. Koshelev. Moscow: Gnozis, 1994.

———. *Izbrannye stat'i*. 3 vols. Tallinn: Aleksandra, 1992–93.

Löwy, Michael, and Robert Sayre. *Révolte et mélancolie. Le Romantisme à contre-courant de la modernité*. Paris: Payot, 1992.

Lunn, Eugene. *Marxism and Modernism*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1982.

Lur'e, Feliks. *Mir iskusstva. Khronologicheskaia rospis' soderzhaniia*. St. Petersburg: Kolo, 2012.

Mackay, Marina. *Modernism and World War II*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.

Magny, Claude-Edmond. *Histoire du roman français depuis 1918*. 2 vols. Paris: Seuil, 1950.

Maguire, Robert. *Red Virgin Soil: Soviet Literature in the 1920s*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987.

Makeev, Mikhail. *Nikolai Nekrasov. Poet i predprinimatel'*. Moscow: MGU, 2009.

Malevich, O. "Vokrug 'Skita.'" In *Ezhegodnik rukopisnogo otdela Pushkinskogo doma na 1994 god*. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 1998, 175–247.

Malia, Martin. *The Soviet Tragedy: A History of Socialism in Russia*. New York: Free Press, 1994.

Malikova, Mariia, Boris Averin, and Aleksandr Dolinin, eds. *V. V. Nabokov: Pro et contra*. St. Petersburg: RKhGU, 1997.

Mally, Lynn. *Culture of the Future: The Proletkult Movement in Revolutionary Russia*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1990.

Malmstad, John, ed. *Andrey Bely: Spirit of Symbolism*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1987.

Mannheim, Karl. *Essays on the Sociology of Knowledge*. Edited by P. Kecskemeti. London: Routledge, 1972.

Marcadé, Jean-Claude, ed. *Le Dialogue des arts dans le symbolisme russe*. Lausanne: L'Âge d'homme, 2008.

Marchal, Bertrand. *Lire le Symbolisme*. Paris: Dunod, 1993.

Markov, Vladimir. "Mysli o russkom futurizme." *Novyi zhurnal* 38 (1954), 169–81.

———. *O svobode v poezii*. St. Petersburg: Izdatel'stvo Chernysheva, 1994.

———. *Russian Futurism: A History*. London: Macgibbon & Kee, 1969.

———. *Russian Imagism, 1919–1924*. Giessen: Wilhelm Schmitz Verlag, 1980.
Marshall, Gail. *The Fin de Siècle*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2007.
Marshik, Celia. *The Cambridge Companion to Modernist Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2015.
Martin-Fugier, Anne. *Les Romantiques. Figures de l'artiste, 1820–1848*. Paris: Hachette, 1998.
Martinsen, Deborah. *Literary Journals in Imperial Russia*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.
Mathewson, Rufus. "Russian Literature and the West." *Slavic Review* 21.3 (1962), 411–17.
Matich, Olga. *Erotic Utopia: The Decadent Imagination in Russia's Fin-De-Siècle*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2005.
Mazgaj, Paul. *Imagining Fascism: The Cultural Politics of the French Young Right*. Newark: U of Delaware P, 2007.
McHale, Brian. *Postmodernist Fiction*. London: Routledge, 1996.
McLean, Hugh. "The Development of Modern Russian Literature." *Slavic Review* 21.3 (1962), 389–410.
———. "Reply." *Slavic Review* 21.3 (1962), 428–32.
McReynolds, Louise. *The News under Russia's Old Regime*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1991.
Medaric, Magdalena. "Modern kak predavangardnyi stil': Mikhail Kuzmin." *Russian Literature* 36.1 (1994), 57–80.
———. "Vladimir Nabokov i roman XX stoletiia." *Russian Literature* 29.1 (1991), 79–100.
Melaney, William. *After Ontology: Literary Theory and Modernist Poetics*. Albany: SUNY P, 2001.
Menand, Louis. *Discovering Modernism: T. S. Eliot and His Context*. New York: Oxford UP, 1987.
Mickiewicz, Denis. "The Acmeist Conception of the Poetic Word." In *Toward a Definition of Acmeism*, edited by D. Mickiewicz. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975, 59–83.
———. "The Problem of Defining Acmeism." In *Toward a Definition of Acmeism*, edited by D. Mickiewicz. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975, 1–20.
Miller, Elizabeth. *Slow Print: Literary Radicalism and Late Victorian Culture*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 2013.
Miller, Jane. *Rebel Women: Feminism, Modernism and the Edwardian Novel*. London: Virago, 1994.
Miller, Tyrus. *Late Modernism: Politics, Fiction, and the Arts between the World Wars*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1999.
Mints, Zara. "Novye romantiki." In *Tynianovskii sbornik* 3. Riga: Zinatne, 1988, 144–58.
———. *Poetika russkogo simvolizma*. St. Petersburg: Iskusstvo-St. Petersburg, 2004.

Monmonier, Mark. *How to Lie with Maps*. London: U of Chicago P, 1996.
Moody, David. *Ezra Pound: Poet; A Portrait of the Man and His Work*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2007–14.
Moretti, Franco. *Graphs, Maps, Trees: Abstract Models for a Literary History*. London: Verso, 2007.
———. *Modern Epic*. Translated by Q. Hoare. London: Verso, 1996.
Morson, Gary Saul, ed. *Literature and History: Theoretical Problems and Russian Case Studies*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1986.
Moser, Charles, ed. *The Cambridge History of Russian Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.
Mosse, George. *Nationalism and Sexuality*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1985.
Musatov, Vladimir, ed. *Nekalendarnyi XX vek*. 2 vols. Novgorod: Novgorodskii Gos. Universitet, 2001–3.
Nahirny, Vladimir. *The Russian Intelligentsia*. New Brunswick: Transaction Books, 1983.
Naiman, Eric. *Nabokov, Perversely*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2010.
Nashchokina, M. V., ed. *Dukh simvolizma. Russkoe i zapadno-evropeiskoe iskusstvo v kontekste epokhi kontsa XIX–nachala XX veka*. Moscow: Progress, 2012.
Nelson, Cary, and Lawrence Grossberg, eds. *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1988.
Nemoianu, Virgil. *The Taming of Romanticism*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1984.
Neuberger, Joan. *Hooliganism: Crime, Culture, and Power in St. Petersburg, 1900–1914*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1993.
Nicholls, Peter. *Modernisms: A Literary Guide*. London: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009.
Nilsson, Nils Ake. *Art, Society, Revolution: Russia 1917–1921*. Stockholm: Almquist & Wiksell, 1979.
Nochlin, Linda, and Tamar Garb, eds. *The Jew in the Text*. London: Thames and Hudson, 1995.
North, Michael. *The Political Aesthetic of Yeats, Eliot, and Pound*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
———. *Reading 1922: A Return to the Scene of the Modern*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1999.
Nosik, Boris. "'. . . Ne vyshlo by ni odnoi strochki po-russki' (Evrei-metsenaty v mezhvoennom Parizhe)." *Evrei v kul'ture russkogo zarubezh'ia* 1 (1992), 501–6.
Nye, Robert. *Crime, Madness, and Politics in Modern France*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.
Obatnin, Gennadii. "K izucheniiu malykh poetov modernizma." *Scando-Slavica* 62.1 (2016), 100–33.
———. "Neopublikovannye materialy Viach. Ivanova po povodu polemiki o 'misticheskom anarkhizme.'" *Litsa* 3 (1993), 466–77.
Ocheretiansky, Aleksandr. *Literature and Art of Avant-Garde Russia (1890–1930): Bibliographical Index*. Newtonville: Oriental Research Partners, 1989.
Oraic, Dubravka. "Tsitatnost'." *Russian Literature* 23.1 (1988), 113–32.

Osborne, Peter. *The Politics of Time: Modernity and the Avant-Garde*. London: Verso, 1995.

Osipova, Nina, ed. *Russkaia kul'tura v tekstakh, obrazakh, znakakh 1913 goda*. Kirov: VGGU, 2003.

Panova, Lada, and Sarah Pratt, eds. *The Many Facets of Mikhail Kuzmin*. Bloomington: Slavica, 2011.

Papazian, Elizabeth. *Manufacturing Truth: The Documentary Moment in Early Soviet Culture*. DeKalb: Northern Illinois UP, 2009.

Paperni, Vladimir. "Bibliia, iudeo-khristianskaia konfrontatsiia i 'novoe religioznoe soznanie' v russkoi kul'ture kontsa XIX–nachala XX vv." *Jews and Slavs* 4 (1995), 166–78.

Paperno, Irina. *Chernyshevsky and the Age of Realism*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1988.

Paperno, Irina, and Joan Grossman, eds. *Creating Life: The Aesthetic Utopia of Russian Modernism*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994.

Papernyi, Vladimir. *Kul'tura dva*. Moscow: NLO, 1996.

Pavlova, Margarita, ed. *Erotizm bez beregov*. Moscow: NLO, 2004.

———. "'Etot preslovutyi plevok v litso. . . .' Iz istorii zhurnala *Severnyi vestnik*." In *New Studies in Modern Russian Literature and Culture*, edited by C. Cipiela, L. Fleishman. 2 vols. *Stanford Slavic Studies* 45–46. Stanford: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Stanford University, 2014, 1: 117–37.

Pavlova, Margarita, and Stanley Rabinowitz. "Russkie Modernen—Zinaida Gippius i Nikolai Minskii." *Russkaia literatura* 2 (2010), 100–28.

Payne, Stanley. *A History of Fascism, 1914–1945*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1995.

Perl, Jeffrey. *The Tradition of Return: The Implicit History of Modern Literature*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1984.

Perloff, Marjorie. *The Futurist Moment*. Chicago: U of Chicago P, 1986.

Peterson, Ronald. *A History of Russian Symbolism*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 1993.

Petrov, Petre. *Automatic for the Masses: The Death of the Author and the Birth of Socialist Realism*. Toronto: U of Toronto P, 2015.

Pick, Daniel. *Faces of Degeneration*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1989.

Pild, Lea. "Po povodu stat'i G. Ryl'kovoi." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 46 (2000), 247–9.

Pipes, Richard, ed. *The Russian Intelligentsia*. New York: Columbia UP, 1961.

———. *The Russian Revolution*. New York: Knopf, 1990.

———. *Struve: Liberal on the Right, 1905–1944*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1980.

Pippin, Robert. *Modernism as a Philosophical Problem*. Cambridge: Blackwell, 1991.

Poggioli, Renato. *The Theory of the Avant-Garde*. Translated by G. Fitzgerald. Cambridge: Belknap Press, 1968.

Polivanov, Konstantin, Irina Shevelenko, and Andrei Ustinov, eds. *Themes and Variations: In Honor of Lazar Fleishman*. *Stanford Slavic Studies* 8. Stanford: Department of Slavic Languages and Literatures, Stanford University, 1994.

Polonskii, Vadim. *Mezhdu traditsiei i modernizmom*. Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2011.
Polonsky, Rachel. *English Literature and the Russian Aesthetic Renaissance*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.
Poltoratzky, Nikolai. "The *Vekhi* Dispute and the Significance of *Vekhi*." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 9.1–2 (1967), 86–106.
Potter, Rachel. *Modernism and Democracy: Literary Culture 1900–1930*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2006.
Presner, Todd Samuel. *Muscular Judaism: The Jewish Body and the Politics of Regeneration*. London: Routledge, 2007.
Presto, Jenifer. *Beyond the Flesh: Alexander Blok, Zinaida Gippius, and the Symbolist Sublimation of Sex*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 2008.
Pustygina, Nadezhda. "K izucheniiu evoliutsii russkogo simvolizma." In *Tezisy Pervoi vsesoiuznoi konferentsii "Tvorchestvo A. A. Bloka i russkaia kul'tura XX veka."* Tartu: [n.p.], 1975, 143–7.
Pyman, Avril. *A History of Russian Symbolism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.
———. *The Life of Aleksandr Blok*. 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1979–80.
Quétel, Claude. *History of Syphilis*. Translated by J. Braddock, B. Pike. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.
Quinones, Ricardo. *Mapping Literary Modernism*. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1985.
Rabaté, Jean-Michel. *1913: The Cradle of Modernism*. Malden: Blackwell, 2007.
Rabinow, Paul, and William Sullivan, eds. *Interpretive Social Science*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1979.
Rabinowitz, Stanley. "A Room of His Own: The Life and Work of Akim Volynskii." *Russian Review* 50.3 (1991), 289–309.
———. "No Room of Her Own: The Early Life and Career of Liubov Gurevich." *Russian Review* 57.2 (1998), 236–52.
Rado, Lisa, ed. *Rereading Modernism*. New York: Garland, 1994.
Rainey, Lawrence. *Institutions of Modernism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1998.
Redman, Tim. *Ezra Pound and Italian Fascism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1991.
Reitblat, Abram. "'<. . .> chto blestit'? (Zametki sotsiologa)." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 53 (2002), 241–51.
Reznichenko, Anna, ed. *Knigoizdatel'stvo "Musaget."* Moscow: RGGU, 2014.
Riasanovsky, Nicholas. *A Parting of Ways: Government and the Educated Public in Russia, 1801–1855*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1976.
Rimke, Heidi, and Alan Hunt. "From Sinners to Degenerates: The Medicalization of Morality in the 19th Century." *History of the Human Sciences* 15.1 (2002), 59–88.
Ringer, Fritz. *The Decline of the German Mandarins*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1969.
Rizzi, Daniela, and Patrizia Veroli, eds. *Omaggio a Sergej Djagilev*. Salerno: Università di Salerno, 2011.
Roberts, David. "Fascism, Modernism and the Quest for an Alternative Modernity." *Patterns of Prejudice* 43.1 (2009), 91–102.

Roberts, Graham. *The Last Soviet Avant-Garde: Oberiu*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1997.

Robin, Régine. *Le Réalisme socialiste. Une esthétique impossible*. Paris: Payot, 1986.

Ronen, Omry. *Serebrianyi vek kak umysel i vymysel*. Moscow: OGI, 2000.

Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer. *Dmitri Sergeevich Merezhkovsky and the Silver Age*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1975.

———. *New Myth, New World: From Nietzsche to Stalinism*. University Park: Penn State UP, 2002.

———, ed. *Nietzsche and Soviet Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1994.

Rosenthal, Bernice Glatzer, and Martha Bohachevsky-Chomiak, eds. *A Revolution of the Spirit: Crisis of Values in Russia, 1890–1924*. New York: Fordham UP, 1990.

Rosenthal, Charlotte. "Zinaida Vengerova: Modernism and Women's Liberation." *Irish Slavonic Studies* 8 (1987), 97–106.

Rougle, Charles. "Recent Soviet Approaches to Modernism." *Canadian Slavonic Papers* 24.4 (1982), 387–400.

Rowland, William. *Literature and the Marketplace*. Lincoln: U of Nebraska P, 1996.

Ruether, Rosemary Radford. *The Radical Kingdom: The Western Experience of Messianic Hope*. New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Russell, Charles. *Poets, Prophets, and Revolutionaries*. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

Rylkova, Galina. *The Archaeology of Anxiety: The Russian Silver Age and Its Legacy*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2007.

———. "Na sklone Serebrianogo veka." *Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie* 46 (2000), 231–44.

Rzhevsky, Nicholas. *The Cambridge Companion to Modern Russian Culture*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Salaris, Claudia, ed. *Futurismi nel mondo*. Rome: Fondazione Echaurren Salaris, 2015.

Sapov, Vadim, ed. *Vekhi. Pro et contra*. St. Petersburg: RKhGI, 1998.

Schain, Richard. *The Legend of Nietzsche's Syphilis*. Westport: Greenwood Press, 2001.

Scholes, Robert. *Paradoxy of Modernism*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2006.

Scholes, Robert, and Clifford Wulfman. *Modernism in the Magazines*. New Haven: Yale UP, 2010.

Sdvizhkov, Denis, ed. *Intelligentsiia v istorii*. Moscow: RAN, 2001.

Segal, Dmitrii. "Literatura kak okhrannaia gramota." *Slavica Hierosolymitana* 5–6 (1981), 151–244.

———. "Russkaia semanticheskaia poetika dvadtsat' let spustia." *Russian Studies* 2.1 (1996), 7–52.

Seifrid, Thomas. *Andrei Platonov*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1992.

———. "Getting Across: Border-Consciousness in Soviet and Emigre Literature." *Slavic and East European Journal* 38.2 (1994), 245–60.

Senelick, Laurence. "Money in Chekhov's Plays." *Studies in Theatre and Performance* 29.3 (2009), 327–37.

Serman, Il'ia. "Spory 1908 goda o russko-evreiskoi literature i posleoktiabr'skoe desiatiletie." *Cahiers du monde russe et soviétique* 26.2 (1985), 167–74.

Shcherbenok, Andrey. "'Killing Realism': Insight and Meaning in Anton Chekhov." *Slavic and East European Journal* 54.2 (2010), 297–316.

Shepherd, David. *Beyond Metafiction: Self-Consciousness in Soviet Literature*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1992.

Sherry, Vincent. "Modernism under Review: Edmund Wilson's *Axel's Castle*." *Modernist Cultures* 7.2 (2012), 145–59.

Sheshukov, Stepan. *Neistovye revniteli. Iz istorii literaturnoi bor'by 20-kh godov*. Moscow: Moskovskii rabochii, 1970.

Shorten, Richard. *Modernism and Totalitarianism*. New York: Palgrave, 2012.

Silverman, Deborah. *Art Nouveau in Fin-de-Siècle France*. Berkeley: U of California P, 1989.

Slobin, Greta. "Modernism/Modernity in the Post-revolutionary Diaspora." *Canadian-American Slavic Studies* 37.1–2 (2003), 57–70.

———. *Russians Abroad: Literary and Cultural Politics of Diaspora*. Edited by K. Clark et al. Boston: Academic Studies Press, 2013.

Smirnov, Igor', and Ioanna Dering-Smirnova. *Ocherki po istoricheskoi tipologii kul'tury*. Salzburg: Institut für Slawistik, 1982.

Smith, Scott. *Captives of the Revolution: The Socialist Revolutionaries and the Bolshevik Dictatorship, 1918–1923*. Pittsburgh: U of Pittsburgh P, 2011.

Smith, Stan. *The Origins of Modernism*. New York: Harvester Wheatsheaf, 1994.

Sobolev, Aleksandr. *Leteiskaia biblioteka*. 2 vols. Moscow: Truten', 2013.

———. "Merezhkovskie v Parizhe (1906–1908)." *Litsa* 1 (1992), 319–71.

———. *Turgenev i tigry. Iz arkhivnykh razyskanii o russkoi literature pervoi poloviny XX veka*. Moscow: Truten', 2017.

Spivak, Monika. *Andrei Belyi—mistik i sovetskii pisatel'*. Moscow: RGGU, 2006.

Stanislawski, Michael. *Autobiographical Jews: Essays in Jewish Self-Fashioning*. Seattle: U of Washington P, 2004.

Steinberg, Mark. *Proletarian Imagination: Self, Modernity, and the Sacred in Russia, 1910–1925*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 2002.

Steiner, George. *Nostalgia for the Absolute*. Toronto: CBC, 1983.

Steiner, Peter. *Russian Formalism*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1984.

Sternhell, Zeev, ed. *The Intellectual Revolt against Liberal Democracy, 1870–1945*. Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1996.

Stockdale, Melissa. *Paul Miliukov and the Quest for a Liberal Russia*. Ithaca: Cornell UP, 1996.

Stone, Jonathan. "Aleksandr Blok and the Rise of Biographical Symbolism." *Slavic and East European Journal* 54.4 (2010), 626–41.

Stromberg, Roland. *Redemption by War: The Intellectuals and 1914*. Lawrence: Regents Press of Kansas, 1982.

Strychacz, Thomas. *Modernism, Mass Culture, and Professionalism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1993.

Sturgis, Matthew. *Passionate Attitudes: The English Decadence of the 1890s*. London: Macmillan, 1995.

Surette, Leon. *Dreams of a Totalitarian Utopia: Literary Modernism and Politics*. Montreal: McGill-Queen's UP, 2011.

Szamuely, Tibor. *The Russian Tradition*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974.

Tall, Emily. "The Soviet Debate on Modernism in Western Literature 1956–1970." PhD diss., Brown University, 1974.

Tally, Robert. *Spatiality*. London: Routledge, 2013.

Tarlanov, Evgenii. "Sotsial'nyi tip diletanta v literaturnoi zhizni rubezha vekov i zarozhdenie russkogo modernizma." *Russkaia literatura* 3 (1998), 43–56.

Terekhina, Vera. *Ekspressionizm v russkoi literature pervoi treti XX veka*. Moscow: IMLI RAN, 2009.

Terras, Victor. *Belinskij and Russian Literary Criticism*. Madison: U of Wisconsin P, 1974.

———, ed. *Handbook of Russian Literature*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1985.

———. *A History of Russian Literature*. New Haven: Yale UP, 1991.

Tertz, Abram. *The Trial Begins: On Socialist Realism*. Translated by M. Hayward, G. Dennis. New York: Vintage Books, 1965.

Thacker, Andrew. *Moving through Modernity: Space and Geography in Modernism*. Manchester: Manchester UP, 2003.

Thacker, Andrew, and Peter Brooker, eds. *Geographies of Modernism: Literatures, Cultures, Spaces*. London: Routledge, 2005.

Thompson, Jon. *Fiction, Crime, and Empire*. Urbana: U of Illinois P, 1993.

Tihanov, Galin. *The Master and the Slave: Lukacs, Bakhtin, and the Ideas of Their Time*. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 2000.

———. "The Politics of Estrangement: The Case of the Early Shklovsky." *Poetics Today* 26.4 (2005), 666–96.

———. "Why Did Modern Literary Theory Originate in Central and Eastern Europe?" *Common Knowledge* 10.1 (2004), 61–81.

Tillyard, S. K. *The Impact of Modernism 1900–1920*. London: Routledge, 1988.

Timenchik, Roman. *Chto vdrug. Stat'i o russkoi literature proshlogo veka*. Jerusalem-Moscow: Gesharim-Mosty kul'tury, 2008.

———. "Zametki ob akmeizme." *Russian Literature* 3.2–3 (1974), 23–46; 5.3 (1977), 281–300; 9.2 (1981), 175–89.

Tjalsma, William. "'Acmeism,' Adamovic, the 'Parisian Note' and Anatolij Steiger." In *Toward a Definition of Acmeism*, edited by D. Mickiewicz. Lansing: Michigan State University, 1975, 92–105.

Todd, William Mills. *Fiction and Society in the Age of Pushkin*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1986.

Toddes, Evgenii. "Mandel'shtam i opoiazovskaia filologiia." In *Tynianovskii sbornik* 2. Riga: Zinatne, 1986, 78–98.

———, ed. *Piatye tynianovskie chteniia*. Riga: Zinatne, 1990.

———. *Tynianovskii sbornik* 2. Riga: Zinatne, 1986.

Todorov, Tzvetan. *La Littérature en peril*. Paris: Flammarion, 2014.

Tolstaia, Elena. *Bednyi rytsar'. Intellektual'noe stranstvie Akima Volynskogo*. Jerusalem: Gesharim-Mosty kul'tury, 2013.

———. *Kliuchi schast'ia. Aleksei Tolstoi i literaturnyi Peterburg*. Moscow: NLO, 2013.

Turchinskii, Lev. *Russkie poety XX veka. Materialy dlia bibliografii*. Moscow: Znak, 2007.

Turda, Marius. *Modernism and Eugenics*. London: Palgrave, 2010.

Turner, Catherine. *Marketing Modernism between the Two World Wars*. Amherst: U of Massachusetts P, 2003.

Turnovsky, Geoffrey. *The Literary Market: Authorship and Modernity in the Old Regime*. Philadelphia: U of Pennsylvania P, 2010.

Tuzkov, Sergei, and Inna Tuzkova. *Neorealizm*. Moscow: Flinta-Nauka, 2009.

Ustinov, Andrei, ed. *Vademecum. K 65-letiiu Lazaria Fleishmana*. Moscow: Vodolei, 2010.

Vakhtina, Polina, Aleksandr Dolinin, and Boris Kats, eds. *Etkindovskie chteniia*. Vols. 2–3. St. Petersburg: Evropeiskii universitet, 2006.

Veresova, Tamara, ed. *V nachale zhizni shkolu pomniu ia . . . Lev Zil'ber, Veniamin Kaverin, Avgust Letavet, Nikolai Neigauz, Iurii Tynianov—o vremeni i o sebe*. Moscow: n.p., 2003.

Von Hagen, Mark. "Toward a Cultural and Intellectual History of Soviet Russia in the 1920s." *Revue des études slaves* 68.2 (1996), 283–302.

Voronova, Tamara, et al., eds. *Knigi. Arkhivy. Avtografy*. Moscow: Kniga, 1973.

Vroon, Ronald, and John Malmstad, eds. *Readings in Russian Modernism*. Moscow: Nauka, 1993.

Wachtel, Andrew, and Ilya Vinitsky. *Russian Literature*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 2009.

Wachtel, Michael. *The Development of Russian Verse*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1998.

Walker, Barbara. "*Kruzhok* Culture: The Meaning of Patronage in the Early Soviet Literary World." *Contemporary European History* 2.1 (2002), 107–23.

———. *Maximilian Voloshin and the Russian Literary Circle*. Bloomington: Indiana UP, 2004.

Wegner, Phillip. *Imaginary Communities: Utopia, the Nation, and the Spatial Histories of Modernity*. Berkeley: U of California P, 2002.

Wexler, Joyce. *Who Paid for Modernism? Art, Money, and the Fiction of Conrad, Joyce, and Lawrence*. Fayetteville: U of Arkansas P, 1997.

Williams, Raymond. *Culture*. Glasgow: Fontana Paperbacks, 1983.

———. *The Politics of Modernism*. London: Verso, 1989.

Willison, Ian, Warwick Gould, and Warren Cherniak, eds. *Modernist Writers and the Marketplace*. New York: St. Martin's Press, 1996.

Winock, Michel. *Le Siècle des intellectuels*. Paris: Seuil, 1999.

Wohl, Robert. *The Generation of 1914*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard UP, 1979.

Wollaeger, Mark, and Matt Eatough, eds. *The Oxford Handbook of Global Modernisms*. Oxford: Oxford UP, 2012.

Woodmansee, Martha. *The Author, Art, and the Market*. New York: Columbia UP, 1994.

Zalambani, Maria. *Literatura fakta. Ot avangarda k sotsrealizmu*. St. Petersburg: Akademicheskii proekt, 2006.

Zholkovskii, Alexander. *Text Counter Text: Rereadings in Russian Literary History*. Stanford: Stanford UP, 1994.

Zox-Weaver, Annalisa. *Women Modernists and Fascism*. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 2011.

Zverev, Aleksei. "XX vek kak literaturnaia epokha." *Voprosy literatury* 2 (1992), 3–56.

Index

Abrams, M. H., 204
Acmeism: aesthetic of, 109–10; critical reaction to, 63–64; émigré poetry and, 134–35; Futurism compared to, 58, 59; Markov on, 38; poets of, 56–57; realism and, 88–89; vanguardism and, 102–3; Zhirmunskii and, 60
Adamovich, Georgii: on Acmeism, 134–35; *Chisla* and, 69, 70, 72; on émigré-Soviet polarization, 120, 150; evolution of thought of, 122, 126–27; on "isms," 132–33; late modernism and, 133; on Marxism, 19; modernism as term used by, 68
Adorno, Theodor, 99
Aestheticism, 84, 85
Akhmatova, Anna: Acmeism and, 56, 59, 64; generational identity of, 61, 146; on modernist culture, 71; NEP era and, 217; on Pasternak, 178; personal mythology of, 224–25; *Poema bez geroia,* 151; on poetics, 103; self-fashioning of, 165; Zhirmunskii on, 60
almanacs: of Briusov, 140, 142, 143–44; literary, 199, 200, 202; *Shipovnik,* 191; *Strelets,* 59
Amfieeatrov, Aleksandr, 71–72
Anderson, Benedict, 22
Anderson, Perry, 3, 30, 173, 184
Andreev, Leonid, 2, 33, 90–92, 107, 111, 164, 193
Anglo-American modernism, 88, 140–41, 147
Anichkov, Evgenii, 52
Annenskii, Innokentii, 55–56
anti-aestheticism, 128–30, 139
anti-realist paradigm, 79–81, 89–90, 94, 95
anti-semitism, 196
anti-traditionalist paradigm, 97
Apollinaire, Guillaume, 59, 102
Armstrong, Tim, 126
Aron, Raymond, 156
art: commercial circulation of, 183; of Cubo-Futurists, 172; left-wing, 62, 63; mass-oriented, 175–76; modernist, 175; Russian modernism and, 155–56; transformation through, 138, 139, 170. *See also* "new art"; patronage
"art for art's sake," 87
Artsybashev, Mikhail, 91–92, 111, 195
Auerbach, Erich, 82
authorship: charismatic, 185, 186–87, 193–94, 197, 226; decline of novel and, 203–4; Formalist writer-type, 204–12; hack writing and, 207–9, 218; Orwell on, 225
avant-garde: Bürger on, 99–100; select events as, 97–98; use of term, 39, 62–63, 76. *See also* "historical avant-garde"; Marxism; modernism
Averbakh, Leopol'd, 120

Babel, Isaac: evolution of, 135, 137; "Guy de Maupassant," 23–24, 25; high modernism and, 127; hybridity in writing of, 93; *Konarmiia,* 107; on visits to France, 220
Bal'mont, Konstantin, 58, 142–43, 163, 195, 196, 204
Balzac, Honoré de, 84

Baran, Henryk, 75
Baudelaire, Charles, 18, 23, 41–42, 43, 84, 96–97
Bauman, Zygmunt, 17
Belinkov, Arkadii, 226
Belyi, Andrei: aesthetic of, 136; on Andreev, 91; on art, 155; "art for art's sake" and, 87; attacks on prose of, 138; Bal'mont on, 195; career of, 31; Chekhov and, 88; on crisis of modernism, 26; on Decadents, 49; on *The Fiery Angel,* 106; first publication of, 198–99; as Futurist, 58, 59; generational reference of, 144; on high-low distinction, 111; on "new art," 45, 46; newspapers and, 193; Pasternak on, 103; *Petersburg,* 98, 105, 109, 162, 192–93, 197, 203; positivism and, 86; prosody and, 204; *Russkoe slovo* and, 192; *The Silver Dove,* 93, 99, 202; as Symbolist, 58; *Symphonies,* 104; on terminology, 51, 53, 54; on *Vesy* faction, 156; younger émigrés and, 127
Bëm, Al'fred, 9
Benjamin, Walter, 99, 203
Berberova, Nina, 68, 127
Berdiaev, Nikolai, 49, 50, 157, 158, 163, 215
Bernheim, Hippolyte, 85
Bethea, David, 125
Bloch, Ernst, 95
Bloch, Jean-Richard, 173
Blok, Aleksandr: on Acmeists, 57; Baedeker guide of, 26, 30–31; Belyi and, 105; death of, 24–25; on Decadents, 48, 50; high-low distinction and, 111; Mandel'shtam on, 102; on mass culture, 182; Pasternak on, 103; positivism and, 86; publication of poetry of, 172; "Pushkin speech," 165; *Roza i krest,* 95; *Russkoe slovo* and, 193; Shklovskii on, 103; Symbolism and, 54, 145; Wagnerian rhetoric of, 196
Bogdanov, Aleksandr, 13, 87, 93, 158
Bogomolov, Nikolai, 142
Bolshevism: clean break narrative and, 114–17; literacy and, 169; Marxism and, 177; officials of, 159, 174; proletariat and, 165; Proletkult and, 176; socioeconomic upheaval under, 206–7. *See also* Marxism
Bourdieu, Pierre, 4, 168, 184
bourgeois, 11–14, 65–66, 154
Bowlt, John, 74–75
Bozhnev, Boris, 127
Brecht, Bertold, 15, 95
Brik, Osip, 215–16
Briusov, Valerii: Acmeism and, 64; almanacs of, 140, 142, 143–44; anti-aestheticism and, 129; on Bolshevism, 115; career of, 158–59; on Decadence, 49; as editor, 189–90; *The Fiery Angel,* 99, 105–6, 109, 202; generational reference of, 144; on intelligentsia, 153; on *Les Fleurs du mal,* 97; Marxists and, 163; on Merezhkovskii, 32–33; on modernism, 45, 53, 100–101; "new art" and, 87; poetry and, 204–5; *Russkaia mysl'* and, 197; Symbolism and, 54, 58; on terminology, 46, 52; Vengerova on, 52
Brodskii, Isaak, 218
Brooks, Jeffrey, 187, 190
Bulgakov, Mikhail, 94–95, 107–8, 111, 223–24
Bulgakov, Sergei, 21, 157
Bunin, Ivan, 35–36
Burenin, Viktor, 53, 86
Bürger, Peter, 99–100, 103, 173
Burliuk, David, 57

Cantor, Norman, 6
Carden, Patricia, 74
cartography: community, modernist culture, and, 21–29, 230–31; of cultural production, 182
catalogue vision, 5–6
Céline, Louis-Ferdinand, 15
chaos, as mythologeme, 17–19
Chapoutot, Johann, 20
Charcot, Jean-Marie, 85
Chekhov, Anton, 23–24, 25, 87–88, 188, 197
Chernyshevskii, Nikolai, 86
Chernyshevskii tradition, 88, 89, 90, 92
Chervinskaia, Lidiia, 127
Chirico, Giorgio de, "Navigators," 31, 32
Chisla circle in Paris: Adamovich on, 72; artistic autonomy and, 219; doctrine of, 139; documentary turn and, 130; "isms" and, 70; as "last of a series," 128; late Russian modernism and, 131–33; mass culture and, 179; modernist sensibility and, 9; simplicity and, 110; Stalinism and, 120–21

Chukovskii, Kornei: Akhmatova and, 124; on Andreev, 193; on Bolshevik officials, 159, 174; career of, 190; on creative period, 204; on economic status, 222; hackwork and, 208, 218; on Marxist attacks on modernism, 163; on mass culture, 167, 188, 189; on professional strategies, 185
Chulkov, Georgii, 33, 49, 50
Chuzhak, Nikolai, 82
classification principles, 78–79. *See also* realism; tradition
clergy, 152, 160
cognition and modernist culture, 7–11
Communism, 80, 165
community, cartography, and modernist culture, 21–29
Conrad, Joseph, 27, 193, 226–27
Constructivism, 165, 166, 218
contrasts: Decadence/Symbolism, 47–52; difficulty/accessibility, 109–10; innovation/tradition, 78, 100–103, 106–8, 112; realism/anti-realism, 78
Cooper, John Xiros, 172, 184
Courbet, Gustave, 84
Crow, Thomas, 181
Cubo-Futurism: anti-mercantile rhetoric and, 195–96; Eikhenbaum and, 146; Formalism and, 60, 99; literary legacy of, 101; modernist community and, 172; overview of, 103–4; as "proletarian" art, 110
cultural consumers, 109–11
cultural historiography, spatial premise of, 113–14, 117–27. *See also* temporal premise
cultural market: anti-mercantile rhetoric in, 195–96; audiences in, 194–95; under Bolshevism, 206–7; charismatic authorship and, 186–87; competition in, 222–23; educated elites and, 188–89; for émigrés, 218–20; Formalist writer-type in, 204–12; intelligentsia canon and, 189; literacy and, 187–88; NEP and, 216–18; patronage in, 183, 191, 212–16, 218–19, 221–26; prose and novel in, 202–4; self-stylization of authors in, 193–94; stages of interaction with, 190–91; state-sponsored autonomy and, 216; strategies for, 189–90
cultural production: in capitalist marketplace, 183; economic pressure on producers, 206–9; geopolitical wall and, 117–27, 138–39; Jews in field of, 196–97; modernism in, 143–44, 174; realist/modernist juxtaposition and, 80; socio-economic aspects of, 185–86; Stalinism and, 148; state control of, 66; structural mutation of, 153. *See also* economics of cultural modernity; mass culture
cultural space: modernism as, 230–32; travelers across, 29–37
culture of modernity. *See* modernist culture

Daly, Nicholas, 13
Davis, Thomas, 78
Decadence: Baudelaire and, 41–42; exiled community use of term, 68; Filosofov on, 51; Gurevich on, 46; as invective, 57; Otsup on, 68; poetic innovation and, 101; Symbolism compared to, 43, 47–51
degeneration, 14–15, 23–25, 85, 154, 163
Department of Visual Arts (IZO), 215–16
Diaghilev, Sergei, 201
die Moderne, as epithet, 45–46
dissident discourse, 226
Döblin, Alfred, 98
Dobrenko, Evgenii, 182
Dobroliubov, Aleksandr, 45, 142, 171, 198
documentary aesthetic, 128–30, 135, 137, 139–40. *See also* "human document" doctrine
Dolinin, Alexander, 71, 72
Donchin, Georgette, 74
Doroshevich, Vlas, 190
Dostoevsky, Fyodor, 188, 197, 209
Dunham, Vera, 166
Duranty, Edmond, 84

early Russian modernism, 41–52, 81–82, 97, 128–29, 135, 144–46
economic origins of modernism, 183
economics of cultural modernity: charismatic authorship and, 185, 186–87, 193–94, 197; interest for "new art" and, 197–98; journals, periodicals, and, 199–202; literacy and, 187–88; overview of, 186; personnae of writers and, 193–94; professionalism and, 206–7; publishing and, 198–201; readership and remuneration in, 189–90. *See also* cultural market

Ego-Futurism, 57, 62
Eikhenbaum, Boris: on Acmeism, 61; on critics, 208; Cubo-Futurism and, 146; as Formalist, 211; on Formalist writer-type, 205–6; intelligentsia and, 154, 175; on modernist maximalists, 165; on "new art," 59; on novel as genre, 203, 204; politics of, 161; on professionalism, 209; on sociological turn, 186
Eisenstein, Sergei, 223
Eliot, T. S., 96, 102, 133, 174, 203
elitism, 110–11, 132, 168, 170, 171–73
Ellis, 50, 52, 60, 156
Ellison, Ralph, 99
Emerson, Caryl, 126
émigrés/exiles: in Berlin, 217; cultural clean break and, 116; cultural market for, 218–20; late modernist sensibility and, 127; liberal democracy and, 179–80; modernism as term of, 67–70; modernist consensus of, 178–79; modernist culture among, 117–27; Silver Age and, 71–72; temporal boundary of modernism and, 149–51. *See also Chisla* circle in Paris; late Russian modernism
Erenburg, Il'ia, 33, 63, 111, 118, 120–21, 214, 216
Esenin, Sergei, 218
evolutionary impatience, 158–60
experimentalism. *See* innovation paradigm
exploratory travel metaphor, 30–31

factionalism, artistic, 72–73
Fadeev, Aleksandr, 107
Fanger, Donald, 125
Fedorov, Nikolai, 86
Fedotov, Georgii, 156
Fel'zen, Iurii, 127, 137
female psychopathology trope, 23–24
Filonov, Pavel, 82
Filosofov, Dmitrii, 49, 51, 161
Fink, Hilary, 76
Fitzpatrick, Sheila, 165, 213–14
Flaubert, Gustave, 84, 187
Fokkema, Douwe, 97
Ford, Ford Madox, 99
Formalism: Cubo-Futurism and, 103; decline of novel and, 204; Marxism and, 18–19; overview of, 59–60; social authority of, 165–66; sociology and, 185–86; writer-type of, 205–12, 215
Forsh, Ol'ga, 121
France: anti-aesthetic current in, 130; émigrés and cultural market in, 218–19; literary history in, 40–43, 62–63, 68; Naturalism and Aestheticism in, 85; patronage in, 183; Realism in, 84
Frank, Semën, 157
French Surrealism, 82, 130
French Symbolism, 47, 51, 58
Frye, Northrop, 4
Furmanov, Dmitrii, 107
Futurism, 38–39, 57–59, 61–63, 64, 73. *See also* Cubo-Futurism
Futurist-Dadaist model, 133, 134, 148

Gasparov, Mikhail, 73, 170
Gautier, Théophile, 41–42
Gay, Peter, 6
Gazdanov, Gaito, 127
Geertz, Clifford, 7
generational viewpoint, history from, 64–65, 141, 143, 144, 146, 147–49
geographic evolution of modernism, 26–27
German literary history, modernism in, 45–46
Ghil, René, 42
Gibian, George, 74
Gide, André, 43, 98, 127, 130, 137, 166
Ginger, Aleksandr, 127
Ginzburg, Lidiia: anti-realist paradigm and, 80; Chukovskii and, 185; contraband and, 123–24; on cross-cultural commerce, 33; on cultural market, 221; on demographic trends, 175; on Formalism, 210; on modernism, 74, 75; on Pasternak, 211, 224; on professionalism, 206; on simplicity, 178; on state patronage, 223
Gippius, Vladimir, 198
Gippius, Zinaida, 33, 45, 49, 86, 99, 143, 190
Gladkov, Fëdor, 107
Gluck, Mary, 185
Gofman, Modest, 43
Gofman, Viktor, 144
Golomshtok, Igor', 226
Goncourt, Edmond de, 84–85
Gorky, Maxim: Burenin and, 86; criticism of, 33; fame of, 193; intelligentsia and, 154;

on Lenin's rule, 159; as Marxist, 13, 87; *Mat',* 163; Mikhailovskii on, 188–89; Socialist Realism and, 44, 115; success of, 167; *Znanie,* 164, 200; Znanie group of, 90–91, 189, 191
Gorodetskii, Sergei, 56–57, 60
Graves, Robert, 39, 109, 134
Great Divide, 110–11, 173–74, 190
Greene, Graham, 99
Groys, Boris, 226
Gumilev, Nikolai, 56–57, 60, 61, 64, 189
Günther, Hans, 226
Gurevich, Liubov', 33, 45–46, 52, 143, 196–97, 200–201
Gutkin, Irina, 157, 226

Habermas, Jürgen, 112
high-low distinction in critical thought, 110–11
high modernism: canon of, 78–79, 97, 98–101, 147; characteristics of, 135, 136; *Chisla* group and, 135, 136–37; deconstruction of novel and, 203–4; eschatological outlook of, 129; late modernism and, 133; transition from, 147–49; transition to, 82, 144–46. *See also* Futurism; innovation paradigm
"historical avant-garde," 99–100, 103, 147, 173, 174
Hobsbawm, Eric, 173
Howe, Irving, 6, 112, 138
"human document" doctrine, 131–32, 137, 139
Huysmans, Joris-Karl, 42–43, 85
Huyssen, Andreas, 20, 110, 173, 190
hybridity of modernist practices, 93–94, 95

Ianovskii, Vasilii, 127, 151
"idea of the end," 128–29, 131
Imagism, 58
innovation paradigm: assumptions of, 97–98, 111–12; Cubo-Futurism and, 101; experimental metareflexivity and, 98–99; limitations of, 107–9; overview of, 96; in poetry, 101–4; in prose, 104–7; reductive vision of, 100
intelligentsia: anti-realism and, 79; "the bourgeois" and, 12, 13–14; chaos mythologeme and, 18; charismatic authorship and, 186, 187; as cultural formation, 152–53; cultural mission of, 168; degeneration of, 154, 163; Eikhenbaum on, 175; in empire of tsars, 152; identity crisis of, 153–54; Marxism and, 154–55; mass cultural market and, 167–68; modernism and, 155–56; modernist culture and, 162–67; nature of reality and, 81; positivist, 7–8, 14; prose canon of, 177, 189; religious ideals of, 160; rhetoric against, 154; as semiotic community, 24; spatial models of, 30; two avant-gardes hypothesis and, 157–67; view of art by, 199
interpretive (semiotic) communities: creative activity and, 151; members of, 34–35; modernist culture as, 228–29; overview of, 22–23, 24, 31–33; sociocodes of, 97. *See also* intelligentsia
Ivanov, Georgii, 124, 134
Ivanov, Viacheslav: on Decadence, 50; essays of, 171; on modernism, 53; on modernist sensibility, 128; prosody and, 204, 205; "realistic symbolism" and, 82; Silver Age and, 71; Symbolism and, 54, 58
Ivanov-Razumnik, R. V.: career of, 33; on Decadence, 49; émigré art and, 123; evolution of thought of, 122; on "golden age," 148; on Marxism, 19; modernist sensibility and, 13–14; on "modern literature," 64; on Symbolism, 9; as utopian, 162–63
Ivask, Iurii, "The Silver Age," 72

Jacobs, Deborah, 79
Jakobson, Roman, 62, 83, 96, 103, 211, 218
James, Henry, 203
Jauss, Hans Robert, 97
Jews in modernist culture, 196–97, 210–11
Josipovici, Gabriel, 4, 29, 36
journals and periodicals: *Apollon,* 52, 55, 145; *Chisla,* 69–70, 123, 124, 127, 134–35, 148, 219; *Die Gesellschaft,* 45; early modernist, 144; early Soviet, 120; format and funding of, 199–200; *Iskusstvo kommuny,* 216; *Krasnaia nov',* 110, 119, 120, 149, 166, 176; *La Décadence,* 42; *La Revue moderniste,* 42, 43; *LEF,* 62, 120, 213, 216, 217; *Le Moderniste illustré,* 42, 43; *Le Symboliste,* 42; lifespan of, 201–2; little magazines as

journals and periodicals (*continued*)
model for, 201; mass circulation of, 183, 187–88; *Mir iskusstva,* 46, 53, 140, 143, 144, 191, 200–201, 202, 213; *Modernism/Modernity,* 4; *Novoe vremia,* 53; *Pereval,* 155–56; return of thick journals, 219; *Russkaia mysl',* 192–93, 197, 199–200; *Russkoe slovo,* 192; *Severnyi vestnik,* 46, 140, 142, 143, 191, 196–97, 200–201; short stories in, 202–3; *Sovremennye zapiski,* 46–47, 119; stages of cultural market for, 190–92; *Trudy i dni,* 54, 192–93; *Veshch',* 63, 216; *Vesy,* 49, 50, 52, 55, 144, 145, 191, 198, 202; *Zolotoe runo,* 201–2
Joyce, James, 82, 98, 127, 150

Kahn, Gustave, 43
Karabchievskii, Iurii, 226
Kataev, Valentin, 69
Kaverin, Veniamin, 69, 136
Kelly, Catriona, 125
Kermode, Frank, 10
Keys, Roger, 38, 76
Kharms, Daniil, 127
Khlebnikov, Velimir, 56–57, 58, 61, 62, 103, 146
Khodasevich, Vladislav: Bal'mont on, 196; on Formalism, 210; generational reference of, 144; late modernism and, 133, 140; on modernism, 29–30; on modernist sensibility, 9; on "new art," 149; on state patronage, 214; on Symbolism, 8, 67–68; on traditionalism, 104; on *Trudy i dni,* 192
Kipling, Rudyard, 22
Knut, Dovid, 127
Kruchenykh, Aleksei, 172
Kuprin, Aleksandr, 188
Kuzmin, Mikhail: on Briusov, 63; on Futurists, 58; generational reference of, 144; Mandel'shtam on, 64; Markov on, 39; on terminology, 54; *Wings,* 99, 106, 109, 202; Zhirmunskii on, 60

Lalou, René, 40
Lampert, Eugene, 147
late Russian modernism: anti-aesthetic current in, 128–31, 139; characteristics of, 135–36; *Chisla* circle and, 131–33; as community facing extinction, 128; cultural openness of, 127–28; disillusionment and, 131, 132; documentary aesthetic of, 128–30, 135, 137; émigré poetry and, 134–35; genesis of, 127; manifestos, "isms," and, 132–33; neoclassical turn of, 133–34; overview of, 126; in scholarship, 140; Stalinist critical discourses and, 137–39; transition to, 147–49
Latour, Bruno, 10
Lawrence, D. H., 58
Leavis, F. R., 132
Le Corbusier, 15
LEF (Left Front of Art), 138–39, 149, 165, 166, 173, 175–76, 211–12
Lenin's rule and two avant-gardes, 159–60, 161
Levenson, Michael, 34, 204
Lewis, Wyndham, 15
life-creation, 82, 163
Likhtenshtadt, Vladimir, 163
Lisitskii, El', 63, 216
literary history, 1–3, 40–43, 45–46, 62–63, 68
literary metareflection, 136–37
"literature of the fact" doctrine, 138–40
Livshits, Benedikt, 57, 103–4
Lotman, Iurii, 75
Lukács, Georg, 15, 33, 80, 95, 173
Lunacharskii, Anatolii, 13, 87, 158, 215, 216
Lur'e, Artur, 67

Machajski, Jan, 168
Mackay, Marina, 225
Maguire, Robert, 206–7
Maiakovskii, Vladimir: career of, 15; criticism of, 175; Department of Visual Arts and, 215–16; Eikhenbaum on, 61; fame of, 195; as Futurist, 57, 58; hackwork and, 208, 218; high modernism and, 134; Jakobson on, 103; Mandel'shtam on, 64; Mirskii on, 214; self-definition of, 102; Socialist Realism and, 115; Tsvetaeva on, 194
Makovskii, Sergei, 71
Malevich, Kazimir, 82
Mallarmé, Stéphane, 42, 43, 100
Mandel'shtam, Nadezhda, 154, 159, 161, 165, 166, 226

Mandel'shtam, Osip: Acmeism and, 56–57, 59, 64; on Blok, 102; fame of, 193–94; on Futurism, 62; intelligentsia and, 154; late modernism and, 133; NEP era and, 217; *O poezii,* 175; on Pasternak, 178; poetics of, 137; on poetry, 103, 210; professionalism, Stalin, and, 224; on state-funded art, 214, 215; Zhirmunskii on, 60
Mannheim, Karl, 8
maps/mapping. *See* cartography
Marinetti, F. T., 15, 58, 59, 102, 216
Markov, Vladimir, 38–39, 59, 72–73, 74, 89, 134
Marxism: aesthetic accessibility and, 110; anti-modernist campaigns of, 150; art and, 176; Bolshevism and, 177; charismatic authorship and, 220–21, 224; Christian eschatology and, 160–61; critical discourses of, 137–39; culture of, 12–13, 168–69; degeneration mythologeme and, 14; Department of Visual Arts, 215–16; de-radicalization of, 161–62, 166, 170; Formalism and, 18–19, 209–10; God-builders, 87, 158, 160; industrial workers and, 171; intelligentsia and, 153, 154–55; mass culture and, 21, 166–67, 169, 174; metalanguage of, 65–66; misrecognition of, 168; modernism and, 157, 163, 164–66, 173; patronage and, 213–15; realism and, 80, 83, 95; treatment of time by, 114. *See also* Bolshevism; RAPP; Stalinism
mass culture: art and, 175–76; Bolshevism/Marxism and, 21, 166–67, 169, 174; minority cultures and, 21, 153; modernism and, 170–72, 174–82; Stalinism and, 222; Zoshchenko and, 177–78. *See also* two avant-gardes
Mathewson, Rufus, 116
maximalism, 158–59, 161
McHale, Brian, 4
McLean, Hugh, 116, 124–25
mediators, artists as, 186–87
Menzhinskii, Vatslav, 157–58
mercantilism, 184–85, 189, 213
Merezhkovskii, Dmitrii: career of, 32–33; Chekhov and, 88; Chernyshevskii and, 86; on commodification of literature, 184; on "idea of the end," 128–29; intelligentsia and, 154; *Khristos i antikhrist,* 99; "L. Tolstoy and Dostoevsky," 49, 202; manifesto of, 140, 142, 171; marketing strategy of, 192, 193; *Otverzhennyi,* 142, 143; on SR movement, 161; terminology and, 44–45, 46, 49–50; on "two literatures" narrative, 123; weekly of, 190
meshchanstvo, 12, 13, 14, 172
metalanguage, critical, 27, 65–66, 70–77
Mikhailovskii, Nikolai, 188–89
Miliukov, Pavel, 30, 123
millenarian sensibility, 160–61
minority cultures: assignment of blame to, 180–81; commerce between, 162; of educated, 152; interrelations between elites and masses and, 167–68; mass culture and, 21, 153. *See also* intelligentsia
Minskii, Nikolai, 33, 43, 154, 157, 194, 197
Mints, Z. G., 31, 40, 41, 75
Mirskii, Dmitrii: Briusov and, 158–59; career of, 15, 33–34; intelligentsia model of, 30; on *The Petty Demon,* 92; on Russian literature, 118, 119; on state patronage, 214; on Symbolism, 67
modernism: as abstraction and analytical tool, 4, 34, 228; analysis of, 7; in Anglo-American scholarship, 39–40; conceptual approach to, 5–7; as counterculture, 152; as cultural community, 230–32; as culture, 6–7, 150–51; demise of USSR and, 1–2; effort to define, 5–6; as metalinguistic tool, 76–77; as minority culture, 19, 228–29; as reaction to mercantilism, 184–85; as reaction to realism and tradition, 78; in Soviet rhetoric, 39, 66–67; transnational, 17, 66, 126, 155, 174; trope of "the new" in, 97. *See also* "new art"; terminology
modernist culture: Akhmatova on, 71; cognition and, 7–11; community, cartography and, 21–29; crises of, 26, 49–51, 63–64, 171; elitism in, 110–11, 132, 171–73; expansion of, 162; factual reconstruction of, 73; historical change in, 139–40; intelligentsia and, 162–67; markers of belonging in, 170; Marxism and, 65; misrecognition of, 168; mythology, politics, and, 11–21; premises of, 82–83;

modernist culture (*continued*)
Realist school and, 86–87; in Russia Abroad, 117–27; as space with core and periphery, 31–32; transnational, 20–21, 31, 34, 97, 123; utopians and, 162–63. *See also* émigrés/exiles; late Russian modernism
modernist sensibility, 8–11, 205
modernist studies, 22, 28, 36, 228. *See also* new modernist studies; Russian modernist studies
modern mysticism, 86–87
Monmonier, Mark, 28
Moréas, Jean, 42, 43
Moretti, Franco, 25–26
Morris, William, 85, 155, 158, 174
Moscow Association of Proletarian Writers (MAPP), 165, 166
myth of 1917, 114–17, 126, 147
mythology, politics, and modernist culture, 11–19

Nabokov, Vladimir: American writings of, 23; *The Gift,* 86–87, 98, 137, 224; high-low distinction and, 111; hybridity in writing of, 93; late modernism and, 131; modernism and, 68; prose of, 151
Narbut, Vladimir, 56
Naturalism, 84, 85
Nekrasov, Nikolai, 185, 188
Nemoianu, Virgil, 5
"neoclassical modernism," 103
neo-/new romanticism, 43–44
NEP (New Economic Policy), 207, 211, 213, 216–18, 221
"new art": Andreev and, 90–91; cumulative effect of, 140, 142–43; Erenburg on, 63; Futurists and, 58; Markov on, 74; Marxism and, 87; nationalistic turn of, 127–28; periodization of, 76, 100; prestige of, 144; promises of, 131; realist/modernist juxtaposition and, 79–80; Realist school and, 81, 90; Russian terminology for, 53–56; terminology for, 40, 43–52, 64–65; two sides of, 93; in USSR, 67
New Economic Policy (NEP), 207, 211, 213, 216–18, 221
new modernist studies: Anglophone modernism and, 141; classification criteria and, 78–79; Great Divide theory and, 111, 173–74; on mercantilism, 184–85; tools of, 4
"new sensibility," 91–92, 93, 99, 106
Nietzsche, Friedrich, 24, 92, 159, 163
Nikulin, Lev, 121
Nordau, Max, *Degeneration,* 14, 18, 41, 85
novel, as genre, 202–4
novyi (new), as epithet, 44–45

OBERIU poets, 148, 149, 208
Olesha, Iurii: documentary aesthetic and, 130; *Envy,* 66, 161; high modernism and, 127; hybridity in writing of, 93; on intelligentsia, 166; monograph on, 226; G. Struve on, 69; *Zavist',* 107
Ortega y Gasset, José, 18, 132, 180, 203
Orwell, George, 225, 226
Osborne, Peter, 10–11
Otsup, Nikolai, 68–69, 71–72, 124, 133, 218

Paris, émigrés in, 120–21, 134. *See also Chisla* circle in Paris
Pasternak, Boris: on Blok and Belyi, 103; on the bourgeois, 12; cultural market and, 211; *Doctor Zhivago,* 224; evolution of, 135, 137; influence of, 127; Mandel'shtam and, 56–57, 64; memoir of, 132; on romanticism, 44; Stalin and, 223; as Symbolist, 58; views of, 178
patronage, 183, 191, 212–16, 218–19, 221–26
periodicals. *See* journals and periodicals
Perl, Jeffrey, 112
Perloff, Marjorie, 101–2
Pertsov, Pëtr, 47, 71
Piast, Vladimir, 71
Pil'niak, Boris, 93, 107, 127, 135
Platonov, Andrei, 33
Plekhanov, Georgii, 164
Poe, Edgar Allan, 23
poetry: innovation paradigm in, 101–4; printing and publishing of, 198
political avant-garde. *See* Marxism
political economy of modernism: for émigrés, 218–20; NEP era, 216–17; Stalinism and, 220–22; state patronage, 212–16, 221–25
political romanticism, 16, 17
politics: cultural toponymy and, 62–70; in modernist experience, 229–30; mythology,

modernist culture, and, 15–21. *See also* Marxism; political economy of modernism
Polonskii, Viacheslav, 65–66
Poplavskii, Boris, 31, 32, 70, 127
positivism, 79, 81–82, 85, 86–87
post-Symbolism, 76
Pound, Ezra: career of, 15; *Chisla* and, 69; on cultural market, 192; Imagism of, 58; on "making it new," 96; on modernism, 39; Nazism and, 18; patronage and, 216; Perloff on, 102; on *Ulysses,* 82; Vengerova interview of, 59
Prishvin, Mikhail, 33, 158, 163, 220–21
Prismanova, Anna, 127
professionalism: state-funded, 221–26; writer-type and, 206–10, 218
proletariat, 165–66, 168–69
Proletkult, 176
Promethean project, 114, 129, 180. *See also* "revolution of the spirit"
prose: in cultural market, 202–3; innovation paradigm in, 104–7; intelligentsia canon of, 177, 189; reorientation from poetry to, 197–98
Proust, Marcel, 43, 98, 127, 137
Puni, Ivan, 59
Pushkin, Aleksandr, 195
Pyman, Avril, 76

Radek, Karl, 115
Rainey, Lawrence, 184
Ram, Harsha, 126
RAPP (Russian Association of Proletarian Writers), 165, 166, 169, 177, 209
raznochintsy (people of different ranks), 153
realism: Acmeism and, 88–89; in France, 84; Jakobson on, 96; Marxism and, 80, 83, 95; modernism juxtaposed with, 79–81, 89–90, 95–96; romanticism and, 84–85; term and concept, 84; term and concept of, 83; as weapon of literary politics, 91–92. *See also* anti-realist paradigm; Realist school; reality; Socialist Realism
"realism of consciousness," 82
Realist school, 80–82, 83–84, 85–88, 90, 92–93, 98
reality, 81–83, 85, 105
Red Pinkerton fiction, 172, 208
referential illusion, 81. *See also* positivism
Régnier, Henri de, 42
Reitblat, Abram, 28–29, 185, 188, 190, 197–98
Remizov, Aleksei, 33, 93, 104, 106, 107, 127, 195
reviews, modernist, 200, 201, 202
revolution of 1905, 40, 67, 90, 162
"revolution of the spirit," 15, 17, 19, 129, 131, 139, 155
Riabushinskii, Nikolai, 201–2
Riding, Laura, 39, 109, 134
Rimbaud, Arthur, 43, 96–97
Rivera, Diego, 175–76
romanticism, 43–44, 81, 84–86
romantic model of authorship, 186–87, 204
Ronen, Omry, 71, 72
Rosenthal, Bernice, 157
Rozanov, Vasilii, 85, 129, 144, 189, 190
Ruskin, John, 85, 174
Russia Abroad. *See* émigrés/exiles
Russian Association of Proletarian Writers (RAPP), 165, 166, 169, 173, 177, 209, 217
Russian modernism: conceptual approach to, 229–30; cultural space of, 230; geographic evolution of, 26–27; methodological approach to, 25–26, 37, 73–74. *See also* early Russian modernism; high modernism; late Russian modernism; modernist culture; Russian modernist studies; terminology
Russian modernist studies: critical metalanguage and, 27, 70–77; empirical focus of, 2, 3; exilic studies and, 124–27; geography of, 140; literature in, 36–37; methodology of, 4–5, 229; revision of, 19–20, 27–28, 36–37; revolution in, 1–2; terminology of, 38–39; textual corpus of, 91–92; transformation of, 226–27, 229
Rylkova, Galina, 71

Saint-Simon, Henri de, 62, 98
Samuels, Maurice, 40
Savinkov, Boris, 33, 163
Schmitt, Carl, 16, 17
Scholes, Robert, 78–79
Semënov, Evgenii, 50–51
semiotic communities. *See* intelligentsia; interpretive (semiotic) communities
Serafimovich, Aleksandr, 107, 115

Serapion Brothers, 127, 131
Severianin, Igor', 58, 189
Shaginian, Marietta, 136
Sharshun, Sergei, 70, 82, 127
Shaw, George Bernard, 34
Shklovskii, Viktor: on Blok, 103; criticism of, 210; on cultural history, 159; Eikhenbaum on, 206; as Formalist, 18, 211; *Mustard Gas,* 207–8; professionalism and, 208–9; on Rozanov, 129; younger émigrés and, 127
Shmelëv, Ivan, 210
Shteiger, Anatolii, 127
Silver Age, 71–72, 76, 116, 117, 180
Simonov, Konstantin, 225
Slonim, Mark, 118
social eschatology, 131
Socialist Realism: Acmeism and, 89; "bourgeois" and, 66; clean-break theory and, 115; difficulty, accessibility, and, 110; Eisenstein on, 223; imposition of, 222; mass consumer and, 169; romanticism and, 44; standards of, 177; works of, 107
Socialist Revolutionary (SR) movement, 157, 161, 162–63, 179
Sologub, Fëdor, 92–93, 99, 142, 143, 164, 195, 202
Solov'ev, Mikhail, 198–99
Solov'ev, Vladimir, 48, 86
sovremennyi (modern), as epithet, 44, 45–47, 64
spatial premise in geography of Russian modernism, 113–14, 117–27
Spengler, Oswald, *Decline of the West,* 15, 178
Stalin, Joseph, client network of, 223
Stalinism: cultural market and, 220–22; cultural production and, 148, 169–70, 180; émigré/exiles and, 119–20; émigrés/exiles and, 178–79; high cultural canon of, 177–78; literary metareflection and, 136; Marxism and, 161–62; mass culture and, 182; myth of 1917 and, 115–16; officials of, 174–75; two avant-gardes and, 166–67. *See also* Marxism; Socialist Realism
Stasov, Vladimir, 46, 81, 98
state patronage, 212–16, 221–26
Steiner, George, 160
Stepun, Fëdor, 8, 67
Sterne, Lawrence, 23
Stevenson, Robert Louis, 213
Struve, Gleb, 69, 71, 124
Struve, Pëtr, 157, 162, 192–93, 197, 200
Strychacz, Thomas, 184–85
style moderne, 85
Survey of Modernist Poetry (Graves and Riding), 39, 109, 134
Symbolism: crisis of, 145–46; Decadence and, 43, 47–52; definitions of, 54; in French literary history, 68; Futurists on, 58; Gurevich on, 46; Khodasevich on, 67–68; Markov on, 38–39; Mirskii on, 67; Moréas and, 42; poetic innovation and, 101; use of term, 65, 75–76; Zhirmunskii on, 60–61. *See also* modernism
Symons, Arthur, 48
"synthetic modernism," 92, 93, 94
syphilis, mythical trope of, 23–25
Sytin, Ivan, 192

Tasteven, Genrikh, 58–59
temporal premise in geography of Russian modernism: beginning date, 140–44; end date, 146–47, 149–51; generational identity and, 147–49; myth of 1917, 114–17, 126; overview, 113–14; transition date, 144–46
Terapiano, Iurii, 134, 151
terminology: Acmeism, 56–57; avant-garde, 62–63; evolution of, 75–77; of exiles/émigrés, 67–70; Formalism, 59–60; French, 41–43; functional utility of, 41; Futurism, 57–59, 61–63; generational split in, 64–65; German, 45–46; imported terms, 58; of Marxism, 65–66; neo-/new romanticism, 43–44; *novyi* (new), 44–45; overview of, 10; politics and cultural toponymy, 62–70; Russian, 40–41, 53–56; Silver Age, 71–72; of Soviet critical lexicon, 66–67, 69; *sovremennyi* (modern), 44, 45–47, 64; uncertainty on, 38–41; in USSR, 70–73; Vengerova and, 52; of Western Russianists, 73–75; Zhirmunskii on, 70–71. *See also* Decadence; modernism; Symbolism
Terras, Victor, 71, 125
Thacker, Andrew, 26
thematic filters, 29, 35, 231

Thibaudet, Albert, 40
Tiutchev, Fëdor, 83, 128, 135
Todorov, Tzvetan, 93
Tolstoi, Aleksei, 33–34
Tolstoy, Lev, 209
Tomashevskii, Boris, 5
totalitarian movements, 15–17, 18–19
tradition, 96, 98–103
tradition of rupture, 10
transnational modernism. *See* modernism
transnational modernist culture. *See* modernist culture
Tret'iakov, Sergei, 62
Trotsky, Lev, 114–15, 158, 165, 166
tsars, empire of, 152–53
Tsvetaeva, Marina, 69, 123, 127, 134, 194
two avant-gardes: ambitions of, 168–69; Great Divide theory and, 173–74; hypothesis of, 156–57; intelligentsia and, 157–67; interconnectedness of, 157–62, 180–82; market phobia of, 167; mass culture and, 167–82; violence as creative tool and, 159–60; weakening of links between, 162–67
"two Russian literatures" narrative, 117–27
Tynianov, Iurii: on critics, 208; economic status of, 222; on Futurism, 62; innovation paradigm and, 108–9; on "isms," 63; on Ivanov-Razumnik, 162–63; late modernism and, 133; on Shklovskii, 210; Symbolism and, 145; terminology and, 38, 76–77; as writer-type, 206

USSR: censorship in, 118, 123–24; critical metalanguage issue in, 70–77; émigré-Soviet polarization, 120, 150; literary canon of, 2–3; modernism in rhetoric of, 39, 66–67, 69
utopianism, 162–63

Vaginov, Konstantin, 136, 207
Valéry, Paul, 43, 130
values of Russian modernism, 156
Van de Velde, Henry, 155
vanguardist metaphors, 98, 104
Veidle, Vladimir, 71–72
Vekhi (volume of essays), 162, 168
Vengerov, Semën: on Briusov, 52; on Gorky, 33; on modernism, 45, 55; on modernist sensibility, 8, 9; neoromanticism and, 43–44; "synthetic modernism" and, 92, 93
Vengerova, Zinaida, 47, 59, 197
Verbitskaia, Anastasiia, 46, 91–92, 111, 195
Verlaine, Paul, 42, 43, 128
Vermel', Filipp, 47
Vermel', Samuil, 59
Verne, Jules, *A Captain at Fifteen,* 78
Vesy faction, 53, 54, 156
Vinogradov, Viktor, 177
Vishniak, Mark, 158
Volynskii, Akim, 33, 46, 143, 163, 190, 197, 200
Von Hagen, Mark, 28–29
Voronskii, Aleksandr, 110, 114, 119, 159, 166, 176
Vorticism, 58

Walker, Barbara, 214
Weininger, Otto, 163
Wilde, Oscar, 22
Williams, Raymond, 7
"will to definition," 5–6
Wilson, Edmund, 39–40, 48
Wohl, Robert, 6, 146, 152
Woolf, Virginia, 82, 98, 99, 174, 193

Yeats, W. B., 48, 174

Zabolotskii, Nikolai, 127, 178
Zaitsev, Boris, 71, 111
Zamiatin, Evgenii, 47, 93–94, 105, 123, 175
Zenkevich, Mikhail, 56
Zhdanov, Andrei, 115
Zhirmunskii, Victor: Acmeism and, 64, 103, 134; baptism of, 211; Blok and, 95; on Formalism, 59–60; late modernism and, 133; on modernist sensibility, 8, 9; on "modern mysticism," 86; on "new realism," 89; romanticism and, 44; on terminology, 47, 70–71; "Those Who Overcame Symbolism," 60–61, 146
Zholkovsky, Alexander, 194, 225
Zola, Emile, 85
Zoshchenko, Mikhail, 115, 130, 132, 177–78